DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 373 891 PS 022 609

TITLE	The Administration Proposal for Head Start Reauthorization. Joint Hearing on Examining Head Start and the Administration's Plans for Expanding and Improving It, before the Subcommittee on Children, Family, Drugs, and Alcoholism of the Committee on Labor and Human Resources, United States Senate and the Subcommittee on Human Resources of the Committee on Education and Labor. House of Representatives, One Hundred Third Congress, [illegible] Session.
INSTITUTION	Congress of the U.S., Washington, DC. House Subcommittee on Human Resources.; Congress of the U.S., Washington, D.C. Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources.
REPORT NO	ISBN-0-16-044348-2; Senate-Hrg-103-542
PUB DATE	10 Feb 94
NOTE	75p.; Education and Labor Serial No. 103-51.
AVAILABLE FROM	U.S. Government Printing Office, Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office, Washington, DC 20402.
PUB TYPE	Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Early Childhood Education; Educational Attitudes; Federal Legislation; *Federal Programs; Hearings; Parent Attitudes; *Preschool Education; *Program Improvement; Public Policy
IDENTIFIERS	*Clinton Administration; Congress 103rd; *Project Head Start; Reauthorization Legislation

ABSTRACT

These hearing transcripts present testimony concerning the Clinton Administration's plans to expand and improve Project Head Start. Testimony was heard from Senators Christopher J. Dodd, Dan Coats, Nancy Landon Kassebaum, Strom Thurmond, James M. Jeffords, and Harris Wofford, as well as Representatives Matthew G. Martinez and Susan Molinari, and Mary Jo Bane, Assistant Secretary for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Testimony was also offered by Sandra Kessler Hamburg, director of education studies for the Committee for Economic Development, Valora Washington of the W. K. Kellogg Foundation, a Head Start program director, two Head Start parents, and a graduate of a Head Start program. An appendix includes prepared statements delivered by Assistant Secretary Bane, Ms. Hamburg, the Head Start program director, parents, and the Head Start graduate. (MDM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

PS

S. HRG. 103-542

THE ADMINISTRATION PROPOSAL FOR HEAD START REAUTHORIZATION

JOINT HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CHILDREN, FAMILY, DRUGS AND ALCOHOLISM

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES UNITED STATES SENATE

AND THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON HUMAN RESOURCES

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED THIRD CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

ON

EXAMINING HEAD START AND THE ADMINISTRATION'S PLANS FOR EXPANDING AND IMPROVING IT

FEBRUARY 10, 1994

Education and Labor Serial No. 103-51

Printed for the use of the Committee on Labor and Human Resources

ED 373 891

PS 022609

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
78-034 CC WASHINGTON : 1994

For sale by the U.S. Government Printing Office
Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office, Washington, DC 20402
ISBN 0-16-044348-2

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES

EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Massachusetts, *Chairman*

CLAIBORNE PELL, Rhode Island
HOWARD M. METZENBAUM, Ohio
CHRISTOPHER J. DODD, Connecticut
PAUL SIMON, Illinois
TOM HARKIN, Iowa
BARBARA A. MIKULSKI, Maryland
JEFF BINGAMAN, New Mexico
PAUL D. WELLSTONE, Minnesota
HARRIS WOFFORD, Pennsylvania
NANCY LANDON KASSEBAUM, Kansas
JAMES M. JEFFORDS, Vermont
DAN COATS, Indiana
JUDD GREGG, New Hampshire
STROM THURMOND, South Carolina
ORRIN G. HATCH, Utah
DAVE DURENBERGER, Minnesota

NICK LITTLEFIELD, *Staff Director and Chief Counsel*
SUSAN K. HATTAN, *Minority Staff Director*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CHILDREN, FAMILY, DRUGS AND ALCOHOLISM

CHRISTOPHER J. DODD, Connecticut, *Chairman*

CLAIBORNE PELL, Rhode Island
BARBARA A. MIKULSKI, Maryland
JEFF BINGAMAN, New Mexico
EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Massachusetts
PAUL D. WELLSTONE, Minnesota
HARRIS WOFFORD, Pennsylvania
DAN COATS, Indiana
NANCY LANDON KASSEBAUM, Kansas
JAMES M. JEFFORDS, Vermont
JUDD GREGG, New Hampshire
STROM THURMOND, South Carolina
DAVE DURENBERGER, Minnesota

SARAH A. FLANAGAN, *Staff Director*
STEPHANIE JOHNSON MONROE, *Counsel*

[illegible] 3

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan, *Chairman*

WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY, Missouri
GEORGE MILLER, California
AUSTIN J. MURPHY, Pennsylvania
DALE E. KILDEE, Michigan
PAT WILLIAMS, Montana
MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ, California
MAJOR R. OWENS, New York
THOMAS C. SAWYER, Ohio
DONALD M. PAYNE, New Jersey
JOLENE UNSOELD, Washington
PATSY T. MINK, Hawaii
ROBERT E. ANDREWS, New Jersey
JACK REED, Rhode Island
TIM ROEMER, Indiana
ELIOT L. ENGEL, New York
XAVIER BECERRA, California
ROBERT C. SCOTT, Virginia
GENE GREEN, Texas
LYNN C. WOOLSEY, California
CARLOS A. ROMERO-BARCELO, Puerto Rico
RON KLINK, Pennsylvania
KARAN ENGLISH, Arizona
TED STRICKLAND, Ohio
RON DE LUGO, Virgin Islands
ENI F. H. FALEOMAVAEGA, American Samoa
SCOTTY BAESLER, Kentucky
ROBERT A. UNDERWOOD, Guam

WILLIAM F. GOODLING, Pennsylvania
THOMAS E. PETRI, Wisconsin
MARGE ROUKEMA, New Jersey
STEVE GUNDERSON, Wisconsin
RICHARD K. ARMEY, Texas
HARRIS W. FAWELL, Illinois
CASS BALLENGER, North Carolina
SUSAN MOLINARI, New York
BILL BARRETT, Nebraska
JOHN A. BOEHNER, Ohio
RANDY "DUKE" CUNNINGHAM, California
PETER HOEKSTRA, Michigan
HOWARD P. "BUCK" McKEON, California
DAN MILLER, Florida
MICHAEL N. CASTLE, Delaware

PATRICIA F. RISSLER, *Staff Director*
JAY EAGEN, *Minority Staff Director*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON HUMAN RESOURCES

MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ, California, *Chairman*

DALE E. KILDEE, Michigan
ROBERT E. ANDREWS, New Jersey
ROBERT C. SCOTT, Virginia
LYNN C. WOOLSEY, California
CARLOS A. ROMERO-BARCELO Puerto Rico
MAJOR R. OWENS, New York
SCOTTY BAESLER, Kentucky

SUSAN MOLINARI, New York
BILL BARRETT, Nebraska
DAN MILLER, Florida
MICHAEL N. CASTLE, Delaware

CONTENTS

STATEMENTS

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 1994

	Page
Dodd, Hon. Christopher J., a U.S. Senator from the State of Connecticut	1
Martinez, Hon. Matthew G., a U.S. Congressman from the State of California	5
Coats, Hon. Dan, a U.S. Senator from the State of Indiana	6
Kassebaum, Hon. Nancy Landon, a U.S. Senator from the State of Kansas	7
Thurmond, Hon. Strom, a U.S. Senator from the State of South Carolina	8
Molinari, Hon. Susan, a U.S. Congresswoman from the State of New York	9
Bane, Mary Jo, Assistant Secretary, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Washington, DC	11
Jeffords, Hon. James M., a U.S. Senator from the State of Vermont	21
Wofford, Hon. Harris, a U.S. Senator from the State of Pennsylvania	24
Hogle, Donna, Head Start Program Director, South Central Community Action Program, Bloomington, IN; Michael Hunter, Head Start graduate, New Haven, CT; Jeannie Kendall, Head Start parent, Paris, KY, and Jill Ryan, former Head Start parent, Worcester, MA, accompanied by daughter Jennifer	27
Hamburg, Sandra Kessler, vice president and director of education studies, Committee for Economic Development, New York, NY; and Valora Washington, vice president for programs, W.K. Kellogg Foundation, Battle Creek, MI	43

APPENDIX

Articles, publications, letters, etc.:	
Statements:	
Ms. Bane	56
Mr. Hunter	59
Ms. Ryan	60
Ms. Hamburg	62
Ms. Hogle	65
Ms. Kendall	68

THE ADMINISTRATION PROPOSAL FOR HEAD START REAUTHORIZATION

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 1994

U.S. SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON CHILDREN, FAMILY, DRUGS AND ALCOHOLISM,
OF THE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES,
AND
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON HUMAN RESOURCES,
OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,
Washington, DC.

The joint hearing convened, pursuant to notice, at 10:30 a.m., in room SH-216, Hart Senate Office Building, Hon. Chris Dodd and Hon. Matthew G. Martinez (chairmen of the subcommittees) presiding.

Present: Senators Kennedy, Dodd, Wellstone, Wofford, Kassebaum, Jeffords and Coats; Representatives Martinez and Molinari.

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR DODD

Senator DODD. The committee will come to order.

I want to welcome everyone here this morning to our hearing on "Fulfilling Head Start's Potential: The Administration's Proposal for the Reauthorization of Head Start."

I have an opening statement, but in light of the fact that we are running behind, and many of you have already heard some of our thoughts expressed during our press conference earlier, I will just ask unanimous consent that my opening statement be included in the record.

[The prepared statement of Senator Dodd follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF SENATOR DODD

Welcome to this joint hearing of the Senate Subcommittee on Children, Family, Drugs and Alcoholism and the House Subcommittee on Human Resources. Our topic today is Head Start and the administration's plans for expanding and improving it.

Head Start is the most concrete example of President Clinton's efforts to redirect scarce Federal resources into investments. Rather than consume for today, the President believes, we should invest for tomorrow. The budget released this week is a testament to his commitment to this principle. Despite painfully tight discretionary spending caps, President Clinton was able to recommend substan-

tial increases for Head Start next year, and I commend him for doing that.

KIDS ARE THE FUTURE

This administration recognizes how important Head Start truly is. For the key to safeguarding America's future is not primarily maintaining a strong defense or building an "information superhighway" for the twenty-first century, as important as those things are. Like many of my colleagues, I believe building a state-of-the-art transportation system is critical, but it is not enough. The future of America is not only in fighter planes or fiber-optic wires or high-speed bullet trains.

I would suggest, instead, that the future of this country is in the engineers of tomorrow who will build those planes, trains, and information highways—our Nation's children who, as we sit at this hearing this morning, are singing, playing, putting together puzzles and learning the alphabet in small classrooms and community centers all across America.

The future of America is about three and a half feet tall and weighs well under 50 pounds. The future of America is our children—and thousands of them get the boost they need from Head Start. Today we will discuss how we can improve their experience and allow more kids to join them.

If, by the way, there is anyone who doubts how a preschool program can affect an individual's future, I hope they will listen closely to the testimony of officer Mike Hunter from New Haven, Connecticut. Mike was one of the first Head Start kids years ago and credits the program with putting his life on a totally different track.

KIDS READY TO LEARN

This hearing will allow us our first opportunity to examine the administration's proposal for the reauthorization of Head Start. This is a fitting week to begin this process. On Tuesday, the Senate approved Goals 2000, a statement of the Federal Government's commitment to education. The very first education goal seeks to ensure that every child in this country begins elementary school ready to learn.

To reach this goal we will need to do a great deal more than simply provide more kids access to Head Start. We must make sure that when they walk through the Head Start door, there is a quality experience waiting for them and their families. In the majority of Head Start programs today, those expectations are being met. In some, however, the experience falls short.

ROAD MAP FOR IMPROVEMENT

We can and must do better. With the support of all the people present today, I am confident that we will. When Mary Jo Bane describes the administration's proposal for the reauthorization this morning, she will chart out a road map that should lead us to a Head Start program that will meet its full potential.

The only way we will get there is if we continue in the spirit of bipartisanship that has characterized Head Start from the begin-

ning. Four-year-olds aren't Democrats or Republicans, they aren't liberal or conservatives. And Head Start defies political labelling as well.

In both the House and Senate, the bill will be sponsored by the chairs and ranking members of the full committees and subcommittees with jurisdiction over the program. I commend the administration for going the extra mile to achieve this level of consensus, and I applaud my Republican colleagues for being full partners in this important endeavor.

LEGACY OF 1990

We began laying the groundwork for improving the quality of Head Start the last time we reauthorized it. In 1990, we set aside funds specifically to improve the program. as we heard in a hearing I chaired last summer, that honey helped increase staff salaries, and higher salaries helped reduce staff turnover.

The money also supported the addition of new staff, many of them providing comprehensive services to the increasingly needy families who come to Head Start. This honey also helped renovate shabby classrooms, so that children would have a clean, healthy and comfortable environment in which to learn and grow.

The reauthorization bill we are introducing today builds on the legacy of the 1990 legislation. The President's bill focuses on giving the program highly qualified staff to serve children and families. It recognizes the importance of strengthening Head Start's capacity to address a whole range of families' social service needs.

IMPORTANCE OF STRONG STANDARDS

Most important, in my view, the bill makes a very strong statement about the importance of upholding standards, standards that make Head Start a model for early childhood programs everywhere. Through provisions to strengthen program oversight and ensure accountability, the legislation says to Congress and to the American people that the substantial investment in Head Start is wisely spent.

But the legislation is not just about accountability; it is also about doing a better job of meeting the needs of Head Start families. For some families, the greatest need is just to get in to the program. While funding has increased substantially in recent years, the program still serves only about 40 percent of eligible children. I am committed to working with the administration to realize the dream articulated in the 1990 reauthorization that someday every eligible child in America will be able to participate in Head Start.

For other families, a major obstacle to Head Start is the difficulty of squaring a half-day program with parents' need to work full-time. Head Start programs technically have always had the ability to offer full-day, year-round services. Now, I believe we will see the commitment to make this happen in cases where it fits the community's needs.

This legislation also recognizes that many families could be more effectively served when their children are infants and toddlers. The legislation sets aside funds and lays out a leadership role for Head Start in achieving this goal.

PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT

Parent involvement has always been one of the hallmarks of Head Start. We will hear today from several parents whose own lives—and not just their children's—were changed by Head Start. Continuing parents' involvement in their children's education was the theme of another initiative in the 1990 reauthorization. The Head Start transition projects promoted such involvement—as well as the provision of comprehensive services—into the elementary grades. The legislation before us today continues to work toward this importance goal.

But we cannot expect Head Start alone to help children and families transition successfully to the new educational environment of elementary school. The schools have to do their part as well. Therefore, shortly after we return from the recess, I plan to introduce the "transitions to success act". This legislation would create a funding priority within title I of the elementary and secondary education act to promote greater parental involvement in elementary education. The bill would also improve families' access to comprehensive social services.

VISION AND DETAILS

None of these initiatives will succeed, however, if children do not have a quality Head Start. That's what the administration's proposal we will discuss today is all about. It embraces a broad vision for Head Start, but does not neglect all important details of its nuts-and-bolts administration.

The vision sketches out the strong, effective program we want to achieve as we move into the next century, and the details provide the road map to take us there. I congratulate the administration on a fine effort in producing this bill. I, for one, am ready to roll up my sleeves and get to work on moving it from words on a piece of paper into Head Start centers all across the country.

Senator DODD. We are very pleased this morning to have a very good list of witnesses. I think you will find particularly interesting those who have come through the Head Start experience. I always think it is helpful to have not only those who will tell us how they think things are going to work, but to actually have people come forward and testify as to how the program has affected their lives.

Obviously, we are deeply grateful to the administration, as has been said already about Donna Shalala and the Clinton administration for moving expeditiously and thoughtfully with this reauthorization proposal.

So with that, let me turn to my colleague, Congressman Martinez. This is a joint hearing between the House and the Senate, and I am deeply grateful to my colleagues in the House for their willingness to have a joint hearing with us. I have often said we ought to do this more frequently, because I think it is sometimes helpful for the public at large to get a sense of how Congress feels, and instead of having to go through two or three or four hearings, to be able to do it jointly, particularly on a matter where there is so much consensus, about the importance of the program, is extremely worthwhile.

So I will turn to my colleagues for any opening statements they may have, and then we will turn immediately to our witnesses.

Congressman Martinez?

OPENING STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN MARTINEZ

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Chairman, I have a statement, but I would like to insert it into the record at this point in time and just say that I am delighted to be here with you. I look forward to this hearing. I think you are absolutely right that we should do this more often. It gives us and the public as well a better understanding of each other's commitments and dedication and questions about the legislation and probably brings us to a quicker solution of problems we might have.

For that reason, I would like to get on to hearing the witnesses and would insert my statement at this point in the record.

Senator DODD. Without objection, so ordered.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Martinez follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN MARTINEZ

Good morning. I am pleased to be here in the company of my friend and Senate counterpart, Senator Dodd, and the rest of the members of both subcommittees. This is certainly a important effort, and I appreciate the cooperation and support of the members on both sides of the aisle and both sides of the Capitol. There are few programs that get more support and attention than the Head Start program, but, the diligence and tenacity the members have shown thus far has brought us farther and faster in the reauthorization process than ever before.

Before I begin, I'd like to take a moment to describe how the legislation we are introducing today was developed. As you know, Secretary Shalala convened an Advisory Committee on Head Start Quality and Expansion to examine the current Head Start program and to develop a strategy for moving ahead with the problem in the coming years. As a result of deliberations over the summer and fall of last year, the Advisory Committee produced a final report outlining the vision of the Head Start program of the 21st Century that served as a blue-print for the administration's proposals.

Since that time, members on all sides have dedicated countless hours to transforming this vision into a bipartisan legislative proposal that will meet the needs of low-income families for years to come. Much cooperation was needed to craft this bill, and all members deserve recognition for the efforts made in producing it. So I thank you, and I am sure your constituents will be likewise thankful when this legislation is finally passed.

The reauthorization bill marks not only an effort to improve program quality, but also a real commitment to achieving excellence at the local level, and a revitalization of the role that regional offices and local communities play in accomplishing that level of program quality. Those programs that are operating high quality classrooms will be used as models for other programs to follow. There will be an opportunity for model programs to mentor other programs in achieving the same high standard. Training and technical assistance will be expanded to reach the programs that need

attention and will assist in developing action plans to help bring the programs quality up to par. Additionally, local communities will play a larger role in developing programs that work to meet their specific requirements through an enhanced community needs assessment process and an array of additional program activities designed to provide flexibility and responsiveness.

In addition to the President's financial commitment to long-range investments in the lives of low-income children and their families, the reauthorization bill fortifies the commitment to capacity building in both the staff and parent levels of each program. New services to parents will be provided in the areas of parent involvement and skills training. Programs will enhance staff development, as part of their quality improvement efforts. Head Start professionals will have the opportunity to develop their leadership skills through Head Start Fellowships.

This is certainly a tremendous step in the direction of providing every child, parent, and program staff, the tools they need to be successful in the Head Start program, and rather than go into specific details about plan, I will let our first witness, Mary Jo Bane, describe the package. In closing let me just say that it has been a pleasure working with the Secretary and Members from the House ad Senate in crafting this legislation, and I anticipate swift and unanimous support for this effort early this session. With that I thank Chairman Dodd, and suggest we move along.

Senator DODD. Senator Coats?

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR COATS

Senator COATS. Mr. Chairman, I will do the same. I have a statement which I will submit for the record, and I look forward to the testimony that we are going to hear and moving forward as expeditiously as possible on this legislation.

Senator DODD. Certainly.

[The prepared statement of Senator Coats follows:]

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased today to join you, Senator Dodd, and Senator Kassebaum in offering this substitute to S. 2000.

Few Federal programs engender the feelings of good will and bipartisanship as do the programs we are discussing today. Head Start, CSBG, LIHEAP, the Community Food and Nutrition Program—these programs all have one important thing in common—they represent the Federal Government at its best, forging public and private partnerships, and unleashing the vast resources of one of our most important assests—the local community.

S. 2000 represents months of effort and cooperation, aimed at not only simply reauthorizing these important programs, but consolidating and streamlining the programs—in order to make the most efficient use of limited Federal resources.

Whether in a Head Start classroom, a food bank, or family resource centers, the programs we are about to reauthorize provide a valuable link between families and the services and opportunities they need.

I have had the privilege of visiting a number of Head Start facilities in my own State, and have found at each one a common thread—the commitment of staff and of parents to be there for their children. In Head Start centers across America, parents serve

as volunteers, as teachers, as aides, in whatever capacity they are needed. Many have told me that thanks to Head Start, they have gone on to higher education. Thanks to Head Start, their children have hope for a future.

The legislation we are considering today continues this legacy, and ushers Head Start and the other community based programs into the year 2000.

I'd like to briefly address one other program of special import to Indiana—that is the LIHEAP program. This is another example of a program which works and works well. It is an efficient program that delivers much needed assistance to Indiana's poorest citizens.

That's not to say that the program couldn't be improved. (The way that Indiana was treated in this year's emergency allocation formula is a case in point.)

The Clinton administration's initial proposal to cut the funding level in half (to $730 million) would slash the number of households served in Indiana by nearly 56,500. This is of great concern to me since nearly half of Indiana's LIHEAP households have at least one elderly or disabled person in them in addition to young children.

I am however pleased that this committee has taken the initiative to statutorily set aside funds for emergency situations such as those experienced this winter. I think we are moving in the right direction, and hope we can continue to work together on this important issue before the bill reaches the floor.

I would also like to note my support for a change in the Head Start Act which not only allows Head Start agencies to purchase facilities, but to construct them as well. A few years ago my office conducted a survey of Head Start agencies in our State, and found that the number one concern was lack of adequate facilities. I think this is an important step forward, which will allow Head Start centers to become a permanent part of the communities they are now serving.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I know this legislation is on a fast tract, and I would like to thank you and your staff for the cooperative and professional nature in which negotiations on this legislation have occurred. It has been a pleasure to work with you toward this important goal.

Senator DODD. I have a statement from Senator Kassebaum that she wishes to included in the record, and we will do that.

[The prepared statement of Senator Kassebaum follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF SENATOR KASSEBAUM

I am pleased to join my colleagues in the introduction of legislation reauthorizing the Head Start program. This legislation represents a true bipartisan effort to connect Head Start funding increases with measures designed to upgrade the quality of all program grantees.

The substantial increases in Head Start funding over the past ten years, combined with proposed increases for the future, raise serious questions about the ability of the Head Start program to use funds efficiently. In addition, reports issued last year by the inspector general of the Department of Health and Human Services

raised questions about the quality of many individual local programs.

This reauthorization bill deals specifically with the quality assurance, monitoring, and training and technical assistance issues upon which Representative Goodling, Representative Molinari, and I focused our attention in developing the "Head Start Quality Improvement Act" (S. 670/H.R. 1528), which we introduced in March of last year. I am pleased that this Head Start reauthorization legislation builds on the program's strengths and allows programs the flexibility to respond to the needs of participants.

Head Start Programs will be able to expand in a variety of ways: by providing full-day, full-year care; by including children aged three, four, and five who are not in kindergarten; and by including services to infants and toddlers from birth-to-three years of age in some Head Start services. The legislation calls for better linkages between Head Start Programs and the community—forging partnerships with schools, social service agencies, and other community organizations.

The legislation provides the Department of Health and Human Services with the tools and the mandate to focus resources on helping Head Start Programs reach their full potential. Stringent provisions are included in the legislation to deal with programs that are not meeting high quality standards.

As the Head Start program continues its expansion in services and funding, there is a need to make some constructive changes to ensure that this opportunity to provide quality services to low-income children and their families is not lost.

I have long supported the Head Start program. However, I believe program expansion and increased funding are of limited value unless steps are taken to improve the quality of the services that are being provided—quantity with quality.

The legislation being introduced today represents a thoughtful response to the needs of the program—and more importantly, the children, families, and staff who make Head Start a success in communities throughout our country. I look forward to working with the Administration and my colleagues to enact this legislation.

Senator COATS. Mr. Chairman, I have a statement from Senator Thurmond to be included in the record.

Senator DODD. Without objection, so ordered. And in fact, any and all statements that House and Senate members wish to be included in the record will be so included.

[The prepared statement of Senator Thurmond follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF SENATOR THURMOND

Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure to be here this morning to receive testimony concerning Reauthorization of the Head Start Program. I would like to join you in welcoming our witnesses here today.

As you know, the purpose of the Head Start program is to effectively deliver comprehensive health, educational, nutritional, social and other services to economically disadvantaged children and their families.

Since it began in 1965, Head Start has served more than 13 million families and children. In fiscal 1983, this program was funded

at a level of $912 million. For fiscal year 1993, the appropriations for Head Start was $2.8 billion. Over the last ten years this program has had its funding increased over 200 percent. President Clinton has proposed an expansion of the Head Start program to a funding level of $8 billion by 1998.

Recent reports by the Inspector General of the Department of Health and Human Services have raised questions about the quality and effectiveness of many local programs. Therefore, we must question whether the Head Start program can efficiently absorb this dramatic increase in funding.

The Head Start program is currently able to develop programs that fit the needs of each local community. This flexibility is one of the strengths of the program. However, the recent inspector general reports identify a wide disparity among the basic services provided by Head Start grantees. We must encourage the compliance of the performance standards established by the Department of Health and Human Services.

Studies have shown that Head Start graduates often lose the benefits gained in Head Start by the second or third grade. I believe we should explore the causes of this problem, and support services to children and families through the first few years of elementary school.

Again, I would like to welcome our witnesses here today, and I look forward to their testimony.

Senator DODD. Congresswoman Molinari?

OPENING STATEMENT OF CONGRESSWOMAN MOLINARI

Ms. MOLINARI. Senator, I just want to thank you for having us over here. Contrary to your impression, the majority of members of the House of Representatives enjoy from time to time walking into the Senate buildings and sitting up at this vantage point.

I will also submit my statement for the record and look forward very much to hearing the testimony from the people who come before us and want to thank you again for bringing us together for this very special day.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Molinari follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF CONGRESSWOMAN MOLINARI

Thank you Mr. Chairman. As Head Start approaches its 30th anniversary, it does so with a impressive history, as well as a new set of challenges for its future. Since 1965 Head Start has provided comprehensive health and education services to more than 11 million children and their families. And, as everyone in this room can agree, this program is a effective way to bring at-risk and disadvantaged children into the mainstream of academic, social, and personal achievement.

However, there have been quite a few reports recently which indicate there are wide disparities in the quality of services provided by Head Start programs, and the existence of the "fade-out effect" in children once they leave Head Start. Since this is a reauthorization year for Head Start, we have the opportunity to focus on and address may of these problems.

I want to thank the Administration, and the members of the Head Start Advisory Committee for listening to, and having open minds to, the may Republican ideas put forth. What we thought was going to be a confrontational process—turned out to be a working group of Democrats and Republicans dedicated to improving the Head Start program. I am proud to lend my name to this truly bipartisan legislation introduced today.

For may years Senator Kassebaum, Congressman Goodling, and more recently myself, have held firm to the idea that what we need to provide children and their families who participate in the Head Start program is quality. With the huge expansions that Head Start has seen over the last several years, and the even more dramatic expansion that President Clinton is proposing, it is absolutely vital that we put into place some necessary mechanisms and safeguards to ensure that any increases in funding are not wasted and that provide for a broad-based quality program. I was quite pleased that may quality improvement ideas reflected in the reauthorization bill were taken from the Quality Improvement Act that Senator Kassebaum, Congressman Goodling, and I introduced last year.

In addition to quality improvement, I and especially Congressman Goodling, have been very interested in strengthening parental involvement and family literacy in the Head Start program. Parental involvement has always been a integral and valuable part of the program—but more can be done. Many parents are already involved in Head Start, and they have numerous success stories. That is great, and it should be continued, but for every Head Start parent who is now involved there is one who is not. And that is what we want to change. We need Head Start programs to seek the participation of parents or guardians in such a way that helps parents become full partners in the education of their children. This is one way to improve the quality of the overall program, both in the short-term while the children are in Head Start, and in the long-term after the children move on to school, because the parent will continue to provide the necessary support for their children to succeed academically.

Congressman Goodling and I, along with every other Republican Member of my Subcommittee, have already introduced the Head Start Enhanced Parental Involvement and Family Literacy Act, which would provide for this heightened parental involvement. Again, I want to thank the Administration for incorporating into the reauthorization package virtually all of this bill.

In conclusion, I want to thank Senators Dodd, Coats and Kennedy, Congressmen Ford and Martinez for making this bipartisan process work so well. I also want to thank Senator Kassebaum, and Congressman Goodling for their dedication and leadership on the issues of Head Start quality, parental involvement and family literacy. It has been an honor to have worked with them on legislation that will provide better services for our country's low-income families, both the children and the parents.

Senator DODD. Thank you very much.

I told Congresswoman Molinari, when she mentioned how much she enjoys coming over to the Senate, that she would appreciate

that the likelihood of the Senate supporting a 4-year term in the House is very slight indeed for that very reason. [Laughter.]

Our first witness has already been introduced. She is Dr. Mary Jo Bane, and I am pleased to welcome her. She serves as assistant secretary of the Administration for Children and Families.

Dr. Bane will be discussing the administration's proposal for the reauthorization of Head Start. She chaired the Secretary's Advisory Committee on Head Start Quality and Expansion, which made many careful recommendations to guide the efforts on this bill. I think you all heard the comments of Congresswoman Molinari and others about the openness and the willingness of the administration to consider all of the good ideas put forth in a bipartisan way.

We appreciate, Dr. Bane, the hard work that you have done, and we are very anxious to hear your testimony.

STATEMENT OF MARY JO BANE, ASSISTANT SECRETARY, ADMINISTRATION FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, WASHINGTON, DC

Ms. BANE. Chairman Dodd, Chairman Martinez, members of the committees, it is my very great pleasure to come before this joint hearing of the Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources Subcommittee on Children, Family, Drugs and Alcoholism, and the House Committee on Education and Labor's Subcommittee on Human Resources, to present testimony in support of the administration's proposal to reauthorize and strengthen the Head Start program.

We are proud, very proud, that this bill reflects the bipartisan and bicameral support that Head Start has enjoyed throughout its history. There are so many people to thank, and I will not go through them all, but I do want to take this opportunity to thank the Democratic leadership of both the Senate and the House committees—Senator Kennedy, Senator Dodd, Representative Ford, Representative Martinez—thank you for your commitment and long-term leadership on this issue.

And of course, I would also like to thank the Republican leadership of the two committees for their leadership and important specific contributions. Thank you to Representatives Goodling and Molinari for a strengthened parent involvement and family literacy section. Thank you to Senator Kassebaum for her contribution to enhancing quality and consolidation. And thank you to Senator Coats for his contribution to strategic expansion.

Since 1965, Head Start has served over 13 million low-income children and their families. The significance of Head Start, though, is not just in the numbers of children served, but in the stories of individual families whose lives have been dramatically changed through their involvement in Head Start.

I wish you all could have heard Diane Hebert, a Head Start parent from Woburn, Ma, when she testified last month at Senator Kennedy's hearing on the release of the report of the Advisory Committee on Head Start Quality and Expansion. Diane, a married mother with four sons, found herself living in fear and isolation in a public housing project, using drugs as a crutch to get through each day. But after one of her sons enrolled in the Head Start program, she too became involved in the program. She told the hear-

78-034 O - 94 - 2

ing how she was able to put down drugs and pick up Head Start. She said, "Each time I felt like I wanted to use drugs, I would go over to the Head Start program, and I too would feel safe and wanted." Head Start gives not only children, but also many parents, a head start.

It was to ensure that the Head Start program would continue to provide quality services to people like Diane Hebert and her sons that Secretary Shalala formed the Advisory Committee on Head Start Quality and Expansion. After 6 months of deliberation, the 47-member bipartisan committee released a unanimous report, "Creating a 21st Century Head Start," which I know you have all seen, which presents the most comprehensive set of recommendations in the program's history.

These recommendations are rooted in three solid principles. First, we must ensure that every Head Start program can deliver on Head Start's vision by striving for excellence in serving children and families.

Second, we must expand the number of children served and the scope of services provided in a manner that is responsive to the needs of children and families. And third, we must encourage Head Start to form partnerships with key community and State institutions, with the private sector, and with programs in early childhood, parent involvement, family literacy, family support, health, education, and mental health; and we must ensure that these partnerships are constantly renewed and recrafted to fit changes in the circumstances of families, communities, the State, and the Nation.

The administration's proposed reauthorization bill demonstrates that we take seriously the recommendations of the advisory committee. The bill incorporates the priorities and the framework identified by the committee, beginning with a strong emphasis on quality in Head Start programs.

The proposed legislation includes tough new provisions to ensure that no grantee will continue to provide services if it falls below a minimum quality level and fails to correct those deficiencies promptly.

Further, the bill requires the promulgation of performance measures, it strengthens performance standards, it strengthens current authority regarding staff qualifications and development, and for the first time, it requires that past performance be taken into account in allocating expansion funds.

The proposed legislation again echoes the advisory committee's recommendations in the area of expansion. It encourages strategic planning at the national and the local levels to ensure that new funds are allocated to communities with the greatest need and to assure that local programs are afforded the flexibility to meet local needs, such as providing full day/full year services to families working or in training.

The bill also includes an exciting new initiative that extends services to families with very young children.

Finally, the bill reaffirms a commitment to partnerships. In particular, it places new emphasis on the need for Head Start to assist children in their continuing educational and social development by establishing effective communications and coordination between Head Start programs and the schools, and by educating parents so

that they can continue to be effective advocates and partners in their children's education after they leave Head Start.

This is a very exciting moment in the history of the Head Start program. We have the opportunity to build on the many strengths of the Head Start program, strengths that have won Head Start the support of members of both political parties, both houses of Congress, the administration and the Congress, experts in early childhood development, and more importantly, of course, the millions of families and children served over the 29 years of Head Start's history.

In the report of the Advisory Committee on Head Start Quality and Expansion, we have a solid blueprint to guide our efforts to renew the vision of Head Start, and I believe in the administration's proposed legislation reauthorizing Head Start, we have the framework to make that vision a reality.

We look forward to continuing to work with all of you during the reauthorization process.

Thank you very much, and I look forward to any questions you have.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Bane may be found in the appendix.]

Senator DODD. Thank you, Dr. Bane.

I will have my staff keep an eye on the clock, and we will limit ourselves to about 5 minutes each for questions and see if we cannot move along.

Again I commend the administration for its efforts here, and I think the remarks by all of us indicate the strong bipartisan and, as you say, bicameral support that exists. So that obviously, now having said all the wonderful things, we ask the questions that point to some of the deficiencies we may see individually.

A note of reticence that I sense both in your statement and in the legislation itself is whether there is the resource commitment long-term to sustain Head Start. Obviously, quality is extremely important, and that has been stated over and over again, and I do not think there is any debate about it. And quality has a cost. There is also, I think, a strong bipartisan commitment to try to include every eligible child. That also demands resources.

And if I could point to the most glaring criticism that I find—and there are not many—in the legislation, it is the lack of any identifiable resource base that will take us into the 21st century, where quality and inclusion will become possible, rather than just rhetorical commitments that we make.

Could you respond to that criticism?

Ms. BANE. We all share, Senator, the commitment to both quality and expansion, and I think the budget that the President submitted to the Congress on Monday reflects that commitment. The President proposed a substantial increase in appropriations for Head Start not only for fiscal year 1995, but as Senator Kennedy pointed out this morning, for the year after that and the year after that and the year after that.

In presenting the budget, the President also noted how tight the budget situation is and how carefully we have to assess what our priorities are. So I think the commitment of resources to Head

Start that the administration has proposed is evidence of our commitment to both quality and substantial expansion.

Senator DODD. I appreciate that, and I appreciate your statement. Still, I think it would really be of great assistance if we could start to identify, given the commitment that exists here, some more predictable and dependable resource base. I think that would be extremely helpful. So we are going to have to work at that, and I would just point to that as a key.

Ms. BANE. We would be happy to work with you on that.

Senator DODD. I want to underscore the parental involvement issue. We allocate some resources here from zero to 3, and I think a critical element of it, obviously, is parental involvement, particularly at that age. But one of the reasons I like it so much is because we are already seeing the difficulty—and I want you to comment on this if you would—in getting parents to become involved in the education of their children. I believe that the reason we are having so much difficulty, particularly with children who are having problems, is that in many cases, they are children of children, children of children or young adults who have dropped out of school themselves, and they recall the school environment as a threatening, hostile environment given their own personal experiences, so that going back into it with their own children is that much more difficult.

One of the reasons I like the zero to 3 is for the obvious reason that it reaches children at an early age and involves their parents, and you may break down some of those barriers that will then carry on into the formal educational process of the child beyond the Head Start experience. I wonder if you might comment on that?

Ms. BANE. I think you are absolutely right. The Head Start program has along history of successful involvement of parents, and as Chairman Martinez and others have noted, the stories that come from parents about the difference that Head Start makes in their lives are perhaps some of the most inspiring testimony that we get from the Head Start program.

The bill that we are submitting intends to build on that commitment to parental involvement, and indeed to strengthen it by putting in provisions that will ensure that Head Start programs involve parents in appropriate ways and involve them in ways that bring together the family as learners, parents and children as participants together in a learning process. I think that is crucial.

And as you note, the provision for the early childhood initiative also focuses on families—it is families with younger children—and we expect that those programs will very closely tie the parents in with activities for their children.

Senator DODD. You should know, and you may already be aware, that I am working on a draft of some legislation to include in our elementary education effort, on the transitional phase between the Head Start experience and the formal education experience. I think that is a critical element, and obviously that point is an important point as well, so we will keep you posted and your staff informed as to how this is progressing. Obviously, we would like to have your input as we craft that.

Finally, your statement discusses ensuring quality by setting appropriate standards and measures and then using these standards

in monitoring. I wonder if you could go into a little bit more detail as to how standards will be more closely tied to monitoring and funding decisions. For instance, are there circumstances under which the Department would determine that a poorly performing program should have its funded revoked immediately, and would that be possible under the provisions for treating the poor performers that you have described?

Mr. Bane. Yes, it would, Senator. The way it will work is that we will establish minimum requirements of performance based on the existing performance standards and on revised performance standards to reflect the whole range of areas that Head Start operates in, and those measures, those indicators of minimum performance, will be what we will be using in monitoring.

Now, some of those obviously are more critical and important than others in ensuring safety of children and health of children and healthy development of children, so we will construct a set of monitoring tools that not only look across the board at performance, but also identify those most important areas. And the legislation will give us the ability, when grantees are performing very poorly in very important areas, to move very quickly to ensure that they construct a quality improvement plan, and if necessary to cut off their funding.

Senator DODD. I commend you for that. I think you have got to have that ability, and that can deal with an awful lot of the problems we have seen in the past.

Chairman Martinez?

Mr. MARTINEZ. Thank you, Senator Dodd.

Let me take off right from where Senator Dodd left off, because it concerns me a great deal. Sometimes quality or meeting the standard is in the eye of the beholder. I have seen in the past—no offense to any bureaucrat—but sometimes the bureaucratic mind sets take over, and to justify their being or their presence or their job, they go in, and they look with too hard an eye. They are too critical, and they interpret things in the worst way, where in an individual setting, in a certain area or region, the program they are conducting is the best they can do given resources, size of community, and everything else. There are a lot of ingredients that go into making a Head Start program quality and the degree to which that quality is.

When you set these standards—and I envision that to set them, you will call in experts from the field and have a panel, something maybe not as public as the advisory board—but my question is are we, then, and the people from the community, the Head Start program, going to get a chance to review those recommendations before those standards are set, or be able to comment how adequate they are or how stringent they are or how unreasonable they are or whatever, so that when we do set those standards, we set them keeping in mind that the main goal of anybody who is trying to hold somebody to a standard should be to do everything they possibly can to retain service to the young person, service to the child.

Ms. BANE. Actually, the legislation actually says, Mr. Chairman, that in developing the regulations, the Secretary will consult with experts in the field of child development, people with various kinds

of expertise, and people with experience in the operation of Head Start programs.

We think the consultation process in putting together the standards is absolutely crucial to get the right kind of balance that you are talking about between a set of standards that ensures minimum performance and that ensures striving toward excellence, but that recognizes that programs are operating in very different kinds of circumstances and that we need to be responsive to that.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Well, I thank you, because I think that is very important especially to the people who are out there. The one thing about it is that sometimes we come along and criticize a program, and the people who run the program ask, "What are they talking about?" We look at our personal results on this local level that we see all day, every day, all day long, and how are they judging from afar. I just want to make sure that when we start judging from afar that we are not too far off-base, especially when it comes to providing that needed service.

You talked a little bit about the involvement of families. I have come to the realization from people I have spoken to who have actually been participants in Head Start or had children in Head Start, that a lot of times, the benefit is not just to the particular child who is in it, but to the families, as the parent in that family changes to the positive action of being involved in that Head Start program.

And in trying to set out the criteria for the expansion and understanding, we must acknowledge that we all know that different parts of the country, have differing conditions and need a whole different set of criteria.

In examining the standards that we are going to set, are we going to look at some of the case results, the actual instances where certain actions and certain standards have led to the success of those individual families?

Ms. BANE. We have had a lot of experience over the 29 years, Mr. Chairman, of programs trying different ways of involving parents and delivering services, and I think we will obviously be able to learn from those experiences as we put together guidelines on parent involvement for the future.

It is, of course, a changing world as well, and we need to take that into account as we develop these standards as well.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Yes, I think you are right, but I am just trying to reaffirm in my mind the things that I would be concerned about, because the last thing I want—and you know that in my area, we have had problems with a couple of Head Start programs—the programs themselves were not bad programs, but the criticism was against the program, and the criticism should have been levelled at the administration of those programs and not the complete program. It was conflict within the advisory board on that local level. We do have a higher authority there that is able to step in and take care of that, which has been done. But when I read the news reports of it, the news reports were not reporting that there were problems in the administration of it that were being handled—and now we have set a mechanism in this legislation that can be handled even on a higher level—that they were being handled; it was just simply that the program was bad, and that led to a belief in

some people's minds that no child was benefitting from that program, and that is the farthest thing from the truth.

Ms. BANE. Right.

Mr. MARTINEZ. So I just want to get some assurances that we are going to take all of that into consideration.

In closing, my personal view of this is that a lot of people do not realize that in many segments of our society, people living in that segment of society are undernourished, and they are ill. And you might wonder how I mean that. Well, I mean undernourished in the sense that they are not being fed self-esteem, they are not being fed a sense of belonging, and they are developing a sense of frustration and desperation because they do not know which way to turn or where to go.

Head Start offers an alternative to that illness to a lot of these people. I think that the illness that develops from that and the symptoms are as much due to, as Senator Kennedy said, the drugs, the crime rate, the dependence on welfare, sometimes a lifetime of dependence on welfare. I have known families that were second- and third-generation welfare recipients, and once one of the young people got into that Head Start program, at least that generation was able to separate itself from welfare dependency.

So I think we have a lot at stake here, and there is a lot we can do, and I am confident that we are going to be doing it together.

Thank you.

Ms. BANE. Thank you.

Senator DODD. Thank you very much.

Senator Wellstone?

Senator WELLSTONE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Assistant Secretary Bane, I apologize for being late. My timing was exquisite—I think you were on your concluding sentence as I walked in. But it is not from lack of interest. I have always had kind of a love affair with Head Start, especially because of the parental—I think as important as what it does for children is what it does to families, and the focus on family development is really important. I go way back to the beginnings in North Carolina and to a lot of work with Head Start mothers and fathers in Minnesota.

I have two questions, and I will stay within 5 minutes. One of them has to do with the phase-in on the infant and toddler initiative. I am going to ask an obvious question, but the fact that it is an obvious question I do not think makes it an unimportant question, which is why phase in—I mean on the funding part. What will in fact be the scope of this? How many families will really be helped, what is the price, and how far short are we of meeting our mark or goal?

In other words, if the evidence is conclusive and overwhelming that these early years are really critical years—and I believe that the empirical evidence is there, and I do not know if I have ever said this before, Mr. Chairman, but for me, having a grandchild is a new experience, and when I watch our granddaughter in a small apartment in St. Paul, and she is now 2½ years old, I have forgotten, because my children are all in their 20's. What I am amazed by is that every 15 seconds, there is something there that interests her—the same apartment. So either we ignite that spark, or we

pour cold water on it, and with all too many children—I think back to when she was 2 and 1—we are pouring cold water on that.

So if these are such critical years for nurturing and for encouragement and for development, why phase in? Why not more of a commitment of resources to it right now? I will ask both of my questions, and then you can respond to both of them; I think that is a more efficient use of time.

Ms. BANE. OK.

Senator WELLSTONE. The second question I have has to do with Head Start as it affects children in Indian country. I am on the Select Committee on Indian Affairs, and I would be interested in your assessment of that.

Ms. BANE. Let me speak to the question of the phase-in of the infant/toddler initiative to start with. The legislation proposes a gradually increasing, as you note, set-aside of funds for the infant/toddler initiative, starting with 3 percent of the available funds, going to 4 percent, and then finally to 5 percent of the available funds.

You are quite right in suggesting that the evidence on the importance of these early years is very clear. It is somewhat less clear from the evidence, though, exactly what the right kinds of interventions and programs are to improve the quality of children's development during those early years. A lot of the reason for the phase-in was to allow some time to build on the knowledge that is being developed, for example, by the parent-child centers and by the comprehensive child development programs, to allow the building of programs so that we can learn about the most effective practices as we go forward. We know that effective programs are those that bring together families and children, but we also know that we need to be careful in designing those programs to learn as we go along and to build on the knowledge that is developing.

So I think the legislation also suggests that we bring together a panel of experts in child development and in those early years to help us design the most effective programs as we phase them in.

Senator WELLSTONE. Could I quickly interrupt and ask you if you have any sense of the number of children eligible and, if you will, in need—okay, we are starting out on kind of a pilot program basis, and we want to measures this—but what percentage of those children are we reaching with this phase-in?

Ms. BANE. With this phase-in, we would be reaching a quite small number of children zero to 3 who are in low-income families. What we want to try to do, obviously, is to target the program to those communities and to those families for whom intervention can be most helpful, and we have to do that on a community level, and we have to do that very carefully with programs assessing the needs of families and children.

We also need to be very flexible, I think, in the kinds of services that are provided to those families. Especially for infants and toddlers, it is clear that families have different needs, and programs need to respond in different ways. Sometimes families will be best-served by parenting classes, sometimes by family resource centers, sometimes by other kinds of interventions in the families, and we want to allow programs the flexibility to be able to do that.

Senator WELLSTONE. I can perhaps explore with you further, if that is okay, about how this would affect Indian children, because I know other people have questions.

Could I just have a quick follow-up? It is not a rebuttal, but it is meant for the sake of creative tension. I understand what you are saying about how we want to sort of know what works and what does not, but it strikes me that that still begs the question of why, given this need—I mean, we could have invested more resources and begun to reach out to help more children, and we would still be nowhere near the number of children who are needy and still be starting out on a fairly, if you will, reasonable basis to measure what works and what does not work.

So I do not really feel like what you said, even though I understand what you said, is a substitute for an investment—I think we harp on the complexity of all this, with all of our language about how we need to assess and all the rest of it, to the point where it becomes the ultimate implication. And I will just say, because I do not know of anybody in the Senate who has been more outspoken on this, that I still believe—I remember, Mr. Chairman, when I was teaching, Marian Wright Edelman in one of her reports said it is not just the budget deficit, it is a spiritual deficit. And I really would like people to understand that when we keep talking about cutting, cutting, cutting, cutting and caps, there is a price to pay, and I think we are focusing on the price to pay, Mr. Chairman, which is that we could be doing more right now, based on the knowledge we have, and we are not.

That is my point.

Ms. BANE. And I think you have identified another really crucial issue that we all need to work together on, Senator, that in this time of limited resources, we have to make some very hard tradeoffs. We are not serving all the 3 and 4-year-olds, either.

Senator WELLSTONE. Yes, that is correct.

Ms. BANE. And part of what we need to do as we work through this reauthorization and the appropriations process is to try to understand and balance the needs of 3 and 4-year-olds and of other children as well.

Senator WELLSTONE. Well, thank you. I do want to be included as a cosponsor. I appreciate the work, but I hope we can push for more.

Ms. BANE. Thank you.

Senator WELLSTONE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator DODD. Thank you very much

Congresswoman Molinari?

Ms. MOLINARI. Thank you, Senator.

Complicating the discussion that just took place, I suppose I just want to State for the record and perhaps echo the statement that Senator Dodd opened this portio of the program up with, and that is that clearly, coming from the Northeast, going through the kind of winter that we are going through right now, it does appear that the President's budget—and I may be incorrect in jumping to the conclusions that the newspapers' analysis have reached—that the money for the expansion of Head Start is coming from LIHEAP, and particularly to those of us who, as I said, have to deal with the cold Northeast winters, that is a difficult decision and discus-

sion. So I would just add that to the reason why you are in a position where you just cannot win in this room.

For my question, though—and I think I know the answer, but Dr. Bane, I would really like this on record—when you represent an urban area, and we talk about expansion of programs, in a lot of areas that we represent, we need to expand the facility also. Where do we provide the providers with the ability to do that in this bill?

Ms. BANE. The bill provides a set-aside of 25 percent of expansion money, as current legislation does for quality improvements, and one of the allowable uses of that money is in fact to improve the quality of facilities.

We also, obviously, take the costs of facilities into account in determining reimbursement and rates and that sort of thing.

The third thing I would mention, Congresswoman, is that the previous Head Start legislation authorized the purchase of facilities, authorized grantees to purchase facilities, which I think will also make it easier for them to respond to their needs.

Ms. MOLINARI. OK. So that is in place here now, and that will be made quite clear to them.

Ms. BANE. Yes, yes, that is correct.

Ms. MOLINARI. I appreciate that.

The other question I wanted to ask, following up on the discussion that did take place—and clearly, I think one of the terrific things about this bill although perhaps one of the most difficult to implement is that there is going to be oversight and monitoring and that there will be occasions when we are going to need to revoke funding for those participants who just do not come up to grade—obviously, that is not going to be a decision that is made overnight, but what mechanisms do we have in place, or are there mechanisms—what are your thoughts as to how we make sure that that group of kids who are currently being served by a program are not just dropped from a program, but perhaps there is another provider that can simultaneously or right after apply for the funds so that there is a smooth transition, in other words, so the children do not suffer because the program is not great, as Mr. Martinez alleged, but is better than going home to no home at all in many cases?

Ms. BANE. We have actually had instances, Congresswoman, over the last decade where grantees have had to be terminated because of poor performance. And I think in almost every case, we have been able to identify quite quickly a substitute grantee so that there have not in fact been noticeable interruptions in services for the children. Obviously, meeting the needs of the children is the first thing we want to make sure happens.

Ms. MOLINARI. Yes. So the Department has been prepared to be doing some background work before that occurs.

Ms. BANE. Yes, and sometimes what we do is identify a temporary grantee who can move in and take over, and other kinds of arrangements to solve a particular problem, to ensure that the children are served during the period that we are either working with the grantee to correct the deficiencies, or looking for a new grantee, which sometimes happens.

Ms. MOLINARI. Great. I appreciate that information. I am sure that is not an easy task, but one that is probably the most important of all. Thank you, Dr. Bane.

Ms. BANE. Exactly. Thank you.

Ms. MOLINARI. Thank you, Senator.

Senator DODD. Thank you.

Senator Jeffords?

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR JEFFORDS

Senator JEFFORDS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I appreciate being at this hearing and look forward to the testimony.

As you know, we just passed Goals 2000 the Senate, and Goals 2000 has already been passed in the House. I know that we still have a long way to go in the sense of providingearly childhood and preschool services. I think we have still only about 40 percent of our kids immunized. Less than half of the 3 to 5-year-olds have any preschool background.

I praise the President for proposing a $700 million increase in Head Start's budget, but even with that, we are still going to be serving in Head Start less than half who are eligible. So if we are going to meet the first goal of Goals 2000, that is, to have all of our young people in this country ready to learn when they come to school, do you have a plan now for how we are going to do that by the year 2000?

Ms. BANE. One of the strong themes of the Head Start Advisory Committee report had to do with the building of partnerships between Head Start programs and other community institutions. I think that as we strive for the goal of all children ready to learn, we need to focus not just on the Head Start program, but on other early childhood programs, on State preschool programs, on good day care programs, and on building partnerships between Head Start and those other programs.

An emphasis in this bill is on strategic planning at the community level, and that reflects a conviction that at the community level, it will in fact be possible to bring together many of these programs to make sure that children are served appropriately and that bridges are made among them.

So our hope is that with the substantial expansion of Head Start that the President has proposed, plus the building of partnerships, plus State efforts that are going on in the early childhood arena, that we can in fact come much closer to reaching the goal of all children ready to learn.

Senator JEFFORDS. Does that mean you are going to look to the States and local governments to pick up the cost of Head Start for the remaining 60 percent, 70 percent of children who are not served?

Ms. BANE. Many of the States are already substantial investors in Head Start, as you know, and provide many good program—and no, I do not want to imply that. But I do want to suggest that there are programs out there in addition to Head Start which we can work in partnership with, and I think that as those programs move forward, we will actually be able to make a lot of progress.

Senator JEFFORDS. Well, if the shortfall to full funding right now is about $7 billion for just Head Start, is there an administrative plan to believe that you would be able by the year 2000 to fully fund it?

Ms. BANE. Well, if you look at the commitment that the President made in the budget that he submitted, it is for a substantial increase of Head Start over the 5-year window that the budget projects, and that takes the funding for Head Start up to almost $7 billion by the last year of the budget projections. That will provide a very, very substantial expansion in the number of children served and in the children that we are reaching.

Senator JEFFORDS. My math may be wrong, but I come up about $3 billion short of full funding. Well, anyway, let us not argue over that.

Ms. BANE. It is actually hard to predict that far out.

Senator JEFFORDS. All right. Now, I know we have had some controversy over the present system of programs—as to its effectiveness. What kind of longitudinal studies do we do—do we have any organized, or are these ad hoc longitudinal studies—how do we know if they are effective or not?

One of the big problems I have is that we have a lot of pilot programs—and this is basically a pilot program, although a large one—but we do not really follow up to find out how well they work. We get some fuzzy feeling that things are going well, or we get from some small study that something is going wrong or which indicates there is a problem, but do we have any real organized system for determining as to the success of the Head Start program children?

Ms. BANE. We have not had over the years the kind of research that all of us would like to be able to look very carefully at the programs. This legislation does propose a research strategy and a research strategy which encompasses evaluations of local programs on a cross-sectional basis, but also proposes working with other departments and other programs to make sure that we have appropriate longitudinal research. The longitudinal research that we rely on now comes from preschool programs, the main one of which is not a Head Start program, but is illustrative of what a quality preschool program can do, and we do have some very long-term longitudinal research on some of those programs.

But I do think that investments in research and evaluation are going to be very, very important over the next couple of years so that we will be able to State more clearly what the long-term benefits of programs like Head Start are.

Senator JEFFORDS. I have just one last comment, Mr. Chairman. It deeply concerns me when we look at the administration wanting to cut the number of pilot projects that we have had going on for years, and I just want to send a message to the administration that I am deeply concerned of arbitrarily cutting them without knowing which ones work and which ones do not work. We have some programs out there which are felt to be very good, and then all of a sudden, we are going to yank their funding away and put it into another program. But I hope somebody has an idea of which ones worked and which ones did not work on some sort of a longitudinal

study basis. I would appreciate it if you would take that message back.

Ms. BANE. Thank you. We certainly will. As you know, some of the smaller programs in this area are actually being consolidated now in the context of this reauthorization into the larger program, and I think that is evidence that we are understanding what their effects are and trying to make them more widespread.

Senator JEFFORDS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have a statement I would like to make part of the record.

Senator DODD. Without objection, so ordered.

[The prepared statement of Senator Jeffords follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF SENATOR JEFFORDS

Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure to be here this morning for a joint hearing between the Senate Subcommittee on Children and the House Subcommittee on Human Resources.

Today we are here to begin the process of reauthorizing Head Start—one of our most successful early childhood programs. Head Start has been helping America's at-risk children for nearly three decades, and this reauthorization will help build on a strong record.

The Administration should be commended for the attention it has given to improving and expanding services to children, especially with regard to Head Start. The bipartisan advisory committee that was appointed last summer by Secretary Shalala has produced an excellent report on the quality of the Head Start program. It has provided a strong blueprint for reauthorization.

I think its three main recommendations hit the nail right on the head. First, we must ensure that all Head Start programs are of the highest quality possible. We must expand Head Start so that more kids can be served. And we must help make the transition from Head Start to school easier, promote stronger parental involvement, and work to better coordinate the many different early intervention programs. One proposal that I think is especially noteworthy is the new initiative for infants and toddlers. Studies have shown, over and over again, that the earlier we get needy kids and families into comprehensive programs, the better.

On Tuesday, the Senate passed Goals 2000, a landmark bipartisan bill to help states and local communities improve our schools. Goal One of Goals 2000, I think, speaks directly to the need for a strengthened Head Start program. "By the year 2000, all children in America will start school ready to learn." We have made progress, but there is still far to go. For example, in 1990 one half of all infants born in the United States started life with one or more risk factors. In 1991, only 37 percent of two-year-olds have been fully immunized for major childhood diseases. And less than half of all three- to five-year-olds from families with incomes under $30,000 are enrolled in preschool. Clearly, if we are to ensure that all children start school ready to learn, we must ensure that the most vulnerable young children get the comprehensive educational, social, nutritional, and health services they need.

But none of this can be done until we commit ourselves to refocusing our national priorities and backing it up with resources. That is why I am proposing a drastic reordering of our budgetary

resources. Last fall, I offered a Sense of the Senate amendment along with Senators Dodd and Simon that the Federal government should increase it's share of the budget going to education by one percent per year until that share reaches ten percent. I'm know the Chairman agrees with me that in order to make good on the promises Congress has made to education and Head Start, we must redirect our resources. I am actively working to shift our budgetary priorities for the challenges of the 21st Century. I think it is a goal we must reach. In fact, I believe we have no other choice.

I am pleased to join as a cosponsor of this legislation. I hope that the quality improvement initiatives in this legislation will help local Head Start agencies absorb the impact of serving more children, which is absolutely essential.

The future of America rests in its children. Much of the responsibility of their future rests in our hands and in their parents'. We must ensure that less-fortunate children and parents have the same opportunity to social and educational development as their more fortunate peers. We must ensure that all young children start school ready to learn. Today, only approximately one out of three eligible children is enrolled in Head Start. Clearly, we can and should do better.

I look forward to hearing from this morning's witnesses, and to working with the members of the Committee to enact a bill that America's kids and families can be proud of.

Senator DODD. Senator Wofford?

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR WOFFORD

Senator WOFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I want to associate myself with your opening statement, which I missed—did everyone else miss it, or did you make it?

Senator DODD. No, but it is there for the world to observe. [Laughter.]

Senator WOFFORD. The future of America is about 3-1/2 feet tall and weighs well under 50 pounds.

Senator DODD. I made that point earlier. [Laughter.]

Senator WOFFORD. And the bipartisanship that has characterized the support of Head Start from the beginning is absolutely essential. I am glad that that bipartisan spirit is here today.

I came back from the Peace Corps in Ethiopia in 1963 and 1964——

Senator DODD. As staff, as staff.

Senator WOFFORD [continuing]. As staff. The Peace Corps volunteers taught me that "staff" was a dirty word, but fortunately, most of them have come home and become staff—or Senators.

But I was in on some of the first brainstorming with Sargent Shriver then and in the later years, when I was back here in the Peace Corps in Washington, and Head Start was one of the babies that was conceived and born. I have tried to follow it over the years, and I do wish there had been more study and research of it. I think that the advisory council's recommendations are very important, and your testimony today is encouraging.

We have to do two things. We have to improve it, and we have to expand it. Senator Jeffords was right on the mark, except that I hope the decisions we are making as to our budget and getting

the deficit under control are going to before the year 2000 enable us to meet the deficit in education and the human investment deficit.

So I welcome the effort to do some of that this year with the expansion of Head Start. I think so often, our problem is not just that we have pilots that we do not adequately study, but that we have pilot programs that succeed, and they do not do then what a pilot is supposed to do, which is ignite the furnace, ignite the whole. I think the Goals 2000 have as one of their great benefits the fact that they put some expectations up that are going to be before us, and that the questions put by Senator Jeffords today are going to be put, and I think more sharply, as we get closer to the year 2000 as to what we can do to see that all children are ready for school. And if it is Head Start that is a key component of that, as I believe it is, then we have to find a way to take the strides in these years to see that it reaches all.

May I ask you, the advisory council's recommendations have stressed the links between Head Start and other initiatives, and that, as you indicated, may be one of the ways that we expand. Welfare reform is coming right after health care reform as a major initiative and imperative in our country. Do you see a link between Head Start and welfare reform? I am obviously thinking initially of the fact that one of the obstacles to people with dependent children moving from welfare to work has been lack of health care for their children and themselves, but the other key obstacle has been the lack of good day care and educational opportunities for their children while they are working.

But in that respect or in others, do you see a connection between Head Start and welfare reform?

Ms. Bane. Yes, absolutely, and I think the fact that the Secretary asked me to serve both as the chair of the Advisory Committee on Head Start and as one of the co-chairs of the President's Task Force on Welfare Reform is not simply an accident, and that we all see that these two programs have to be very closely linked together, and linked in a number of important ways. As we do a welfare reform that is based on helping people move into work and become prepared for work, it is going to be very important that we provide the supports for them and for their children to ensure that the children develop well under those circumstances. Head Start is a very important player there, and we are going to try to make sure that that all works.

We are also going to try to make sure that the Head Start program is able to provide some of the opportunities for parents that so many people have talked about to help them make that transition into the work world.

Senator WOFFORD. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator DODD. Thank you very much, Senator Wofford.

You may be aware, Dr. Bane, that Senator Jeffords and I have authorized various proposals, "sense of the Senate" resolutions to try to commit at least 10 percent of the Federal budget by the year 2004 to education in this country, at least preschool, elementary and secondary education.

What I would like to ask—and I have spoken with my colleague, the chairman on the House side, and he can speak for himself on

this—but we would like to request of the administration that you lay out for us over the next several months, if you would, what are the numbers that we ought to be looking at to fully fund Head Start by the year 2004, 10 years from now, to fully include zero to 3, and what should we be looking at on an annual basis to achieve that goal.

Now, we are not expecting you to endorse necessarily or to say this is going to be the administration's position. I would not put you in that position. But we would like to have an assessment so that as we look at these numbers, we would have some basis on which to approach the Budget Committee and the Appropriations Committee and other respective committees as we look at our requests which we are going to be making on an annual basis to achieve that goal. It might give us all a sense of benchmarks. And obviously, those numbers may be moderated, may be expanded or contracted for whatever set of reasons, but I think it would be very helpful to all of us if we had some idea and some projection as to what was going to be needed if we were going to achieve the goals that we have all laid out.

So I would respectfully make that request of the Department on behalf of both of us. I do not know if you wish to make any comment on that, Marty.

Mr. MARTINEZ. I think it is an excellent idea. I think it is something that we really need to have as we go forth and talk about reaching a certain goal. It has been talked about for years, full funding; even President Bush signed an Executive order for full funding by a year certain, and that year is upon us, and we are nowhere near full funding.

So I think it has been the intent of both administrations and certainly of both the House and Senate, and I think it is something we really should start getting serious about if we are really, as Senator Kennedy said, going to invest in that greatest resource we have, which is our children, to ensure that our future is not as it is today, as Senator Dodd described in his opening statement, because we are losing ground, and we need to do something to curb that, and that is one of the ways we can do it.

Ms. BANE. We would be delighted to work together with you in producing that.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Thank you.

Senator DODD. I thank you for that.

If there are no further questions, I will thank you very, very much, Dr. Bane, and again, our thanks to Secretary Shalala and your entire staff for the tremendous work you have done in putting this proposal together. We will be working very closely with you in the coming weeks.

Ms. BANE. Thank you. I look forward to it.

Mr. MARTINEZ. At this time, it gives me great pleasure to introduce our next panel, which consists of Donna Hogle, program director from Bloomington, IN, and she is from Senator Coats' district. Next is Michael Hunter, a Head Start graduate from New Haven, CT, a constituent of Senator Dodd.

Senator Dodd, is there anything you would like to say?

Senator DODD. I just want to welcome Michael. Michael Hunter is a police officer from New Haven, CT. In the mid-1960's, he was

one of the first participants in New Haven's Head Start program, and this morning he is going to share with us his early experience and how Head Start contributed to his successes that he enjoys today. I think he is a prime example of what a Head Start graduate can be.

We are very proud of you and grateful to you for taking time, Michael, for coming down this morning and participate in this hearing.

It was mentioned earlier today by Dr. Bane that there have been 13 million students who have gone through the Head Start program in 29 years, and Michael was one of the very first in the country to do so and is an example of what a difference Head Start can make. So we are grateful to you for being here.

Senator WOFFORD. We might call you a "walking longitudinal study."

Senator DODD. Yes. That will satisfy all the wonks in the room. [Laughter.] It may be an acronym for that, too.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Very good, Senator Wofford.

Our next witness on this panel is Jeannie Kendall, a very delightful person from Paris, KY. She is a constituent of Congressman Baesler, who is a member of the committee but was unable to be here today. She has also been invited as a witness by the ranking minority member, Bill Goodling.

Last but not least is Jill Ryan, a Head Start parent from Worcester, MA. She is a witness who has been invited by Senator Kennedy, and she is joined by her daughter, Jennifer.

Senator DODD. They are almost in Connecticut, I should say; it is very close to the border.

Mr. MARTINEZ. We welcome you all, and we will start with Donna Hogle.

STATEMENTS OF DONNA HOGLE, HEAD START PROGRAM DIRECTOR, SOUTH CENTRAL COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAM, BLOOMINGTON, IN; MICHAEL HUNTER, HEAD START GRADUATE, NEW HAVEN, CT; JEANNIE KENDALL, HEAD START PARENT, PARIS, KY, AND JILL RYAN, FORMER HEAD START PARENT, WORCESTER, MA, ACCOMPANIED BY DAUGHTER JENNIFER

Ms. HOGLE. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I would like to thank you for the opportunity to speak with you today.

The Indiana Head Start programs greatly appreciate your continued support and interest regarding the services that we provide our children, families and communities. I would like to give a special thank you to Senator Coats, who I am sorry is not here, for his concern regarding the Hoosier Head Start programs.

My name is Donna Hogle. I am the Head Start director for the South Central Community Action Head Start Program in Bloomington, IN, which is 48 miles south of Indianapolis. I have been in Head Start since 1976 and became the director in 1979.

The observations that I share with you today are based on my experiences as a director, my training background in home economics, community development, and instructional technology, and most importantly, my discussions with other Head Start programs.

I am here to represent both my program and the Indiana Head Start Association, of which I have been a member for 16 years. I am currently on the board of the association.

My program is a one-county program serving 191 children in an urban and small-town setting. We provide part-day programming for children through three educational options. Our services are housed in three sites—one built by our grantee, one located in the county parks and recreation center, and the third in a housing authority community room.

Our mission is to provide growth opportunities for low-income children and their families through the combined resources of families, staff, and community. Our program vision is to provide or secure comprehensive service for low-income families of children ages birth through 8.

In my preparation for the testimony, I reviewed "Creating a 21st Century Head Start," the final report of the advisory committee, which you spoke of earlier. I was extremely impressed with the thoughtfulness and comprehensiveness of their recommendations. As I read the report, I was both excited about the prospects in terms of my program's vision and at the same time, pretty overwhelmed at the thought of implementing them.

I think I can say the Indiana Head Start Association endorses the findings of the final report. We believe that the issues of quality, excellence, flexibility and partnerships must be addressed in order for Head Start to achieve its potential impact on the lives of our children and families.

As an association, we are committed to support the implementation of the advisory committee recommendations. We therefore encourage Congress to continue to provide the 25 percent quality set-aside moneys so that programs can raise standards of services and quality of staff. We encourage Congress to ensure that local programs have flexibility to expand services so as to accommodate full-year, full-day programs and services to infants and toddlers. Like so many States, Indiana's communities reflect a wide range of cultures and needs. We wish to meet the needs, whether they are rural Amish families or those families living in urban settings.

We encourage a redesign of the Federal oversight to ensure more program accountability as well as contact. We would like to have increased technical assistance occurring between regional offices and local programs. In other words, we would like a stronger partnership.

I am sure you are familiar with the parable that ends with the statement: "But for the want of a nail, the war was lost." It begins with a farrier putting new shoes on a general's horse. He fails to do a thorough job, and as a result, the horse loses a shoe, the general is killed, and the war is ultimately lost.

As you begin to consider the reauthorization of Head Start, we would like you to consider the integrated and holistic nature of Head Start. Like the general, we will not be able to do our job if the basic foundations are not in place. You, the Congress, provide those foundations.

Concurrently, it is critical that consideration be given regarding the impact of changes and how they ripple throughout the Head Start program. Head Start programs are complex and inter-

connected systems. Each component depends on the success of the other component. I would like to give you an example of what I mean.

When I surveyed a number of urban and rural Head Start programs in order to prepare this testimony, I asked them what they considered to be the main issues in Indiana. While the comments were varied, most of them boiled down to lack of adequate facilities and qualified, appropriately-paid staff. Key comments regarding facilities were that most programs are dealing with costly and inadequate facilities. We cannot provide quality early childhood education in some facilities we are forced to use—that is, if we can find them.

We spend large sums of money on buildings owned by others, and when they need the facility, we are both out of the space and the moneys we have invested.

Even though we need to have some day care, we have no locations. The lack of space affects our ability to provide greater flexibility in programming.

According to Indiana child care licensing, Head Start programs do not need to be licensed because of the length of our day. Head Start programs, however, wish to be licensed as part of our quality efforts in Indiana. Yet we cannot find centers to meet the licensing standards. One of the urban programs which has 28 centers currently has 25 that are not licensed due to the inadequacy of the sites. They ask: Where and how should we spend our moneys?

At our on-site review, it was strongly recommended that we relocate to another space, as the one we were in was inadequate. We could not find one.

And finally, the way the current funding system is, we do not have time to locate adequate facilities to expand our services. Everything is hurry up and do it yesterday; we have no time to plan.

I would like to share my program's situation with you. In the last 27 years, we have been located in over 12 different locations, which I am sure for an urban program is not many. But after many years of trying to locate appropriate sites, our grantee built us a wonderful new building that we moved into in January of 1993. It has enabled us to provide a developmentally appropriate environment for children, to expand the number of children we serve, and, and to provide space for parent activities.

However, we have lost over $50,000 of in-kind. We now have new and different costs to consider, and we have no place to grow due to the original funding limitations in terms of our building size. As I have said, in Head Start, everything is interrelated.

I would like to digress for a moment and further expand on my commend related to in-kind. For 27 years, Head Start communities have demonstrated ongoing support of their Head Start programs. Yet as more services enter communities, Head Start budgets increase, Head Start programs purchase their own buildings, and parents enter the work force or school, raising in-kind has been increasingly difficult. At this time, Indiana does not provide any financial support for Head Start programs. There have been times when I have entertained the notion of not applying for more HHS moneys.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

While I do think in-kind is an important demonstration of community support, I would like to suggest that the amount required by reviewed and assessed.

The second most mentioned issue by Head Start programs relates to the quality issue of staff and their salaries. When I surveyed the Indiana Head Start programs, nearly all mentioned this issue. I am sure you have heard many of these comments before, but I would like to share them with you.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Ms. Hogle, let me interrupt you for a second. We are trying to hold the witnesses to 5 minutes, and you have 1 minute left to wrap up.

Ms. HOGLE. OK. I am sorry. I will just wrap up real quickly, then.

The Head Start programs of Indiana encourage you to carry out the recommendations of the advisory committee in terms of improving the training systems and salary enhancement of staff. The quality of any organization is only as high as the quality of the staff. The managers are only as effective as those people who actually carry out the job tasks.

In the years I have been a Head Start director, I have seen shifts in the directions of the program. What has clearly shifted is that we are no longer able to be satisfied with being a "maternalistic presence" in the lives of children and families. By this, I mean parents often perceive Head Start as a maternal and nurturing support system. We must increasingly establish a system that carries out the business of Head Start in an effective yet humanistic manner.

I believe that Indiana Head Start programs desire to provide the best services possible, and if this committee will heed the wise words of the advisory committee and incorporate their findings into the reauthorization of Head Start, we can demonstrate to the American taxpayer our worth as contributors to a better society.

Thank you very much.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Hogle may be found in the appendix.]

Mr. MARTINEZ. At this time, we will hear from Mr. Hunter.

Mr. HUNTER. My name is Michael Hunter, and I have been a police officer in the City of New Haven for approximately 2½ years. I was born and raised there.

I would first like to thank you for this opportunity to be able to give this testimony.

In today's time, our Nation is faced with an epidemic of firearm violence, and we are forced to protect ourselves and our families against drug dealers, thereby declaring war on these individuals.

In my earlier years as a preschooler, gun play was not an epidemic running rampant through our Nation's cities and neighborhoods. The epidemic that exists today is like a cancer, clinging onto every youth it comes in contact with.

I come before you today to say that I was faced at one time with the same disadvantages of growing up in a broken home and being raised by my mother in a housing project in the City of New Haven. I could easily have become part of the problem this Nation faces today with our youth. But unlike many other children, I re-

ceived an early start in life when my mother enrolled me in a new program called Head Start.

The Head Start program embraced me and set me on a positive path in life, instilling in me as a preschooler positive hopes and dreams of a different way of life. The Head Start program also awakened me as a preschooler to know that my dreams of a better life could be achieved within the boundaries of the laws of society.

When we take charge of our youth by giving them alternative programs such as Head Start, they receive a better foundation and sense of direction before the streets have a chance to trap them.

We should all know that we have no time to waste. Acts of violence involving firearms have grown to the point where there should not be any question that parents should have the opportunity to enroll their children in Head Start. Time is running out; it is gone. The time to act is now, without hesitation or second thoughts. As we all know, it is not often you get a second chance.

As I mentioned earlier, this epidemic is like a cancer which needs early treatment. The treatment is simple. We need to embrace our children early, before the streets do. We need a Head Start program which will give us the first opportunity to instill values in our preschoolers which they will be able to carry through life. This will allow them to embrace their dreams as they were embraced earlier in life.

It is time to realize that what we teach and instill in our children early never leaves them, whether it be positive or negative. It will determine the roads our children will take in life. The Head Start program is early treatment to the deviant social behavior our Nation faces today.

The deterioration of our youths' value system and dreams of a fulfilling life is to the point that we cannot afford not to have the Head Start program. When I think about all the positive experiences and accomplishments in my life, I know they are due to Head Start's philosophy. Head Start provided the nurturing at an early age and instilled a "Yes, I can" attitude in me.

When you grow up in an environment such as I did, where every vice and temptation is lurking about, it is so easy to get involved, and before you know it, you are trapped in a life of degradation.

Head Start, its name alone, tells what it did for me. Its positive reinforcement provided a mental checklist to help me make good choices early in life. When a child is provided with good nurturing and positive role models, and given the tools to make good choices early in life, the return dividends are endless.

As a police officer, I witness every day what makes a child fail in life. I will cite one example, due to the short time span today. When a child is home with parents who are substance abuse-dependent, their learning environment, nutrition, mental health, and their safety are all in jeopardy. Because of this negative environment, it is most likely the beginning of that child's downfall. These parents are unable to live productive lives for themselves, let alone provide for the child's needs.

Through my experience with Head Start and as a parent, I have found that the Head Start program, with its recruitment techniques, can refer the family to the proper support mechanisms it

needs, while at the same time providing a learning environment for their preschoolers.

Ladies and gentlemen, I want to thank you today for giving me this opportunity. One positive thing I mentioned in my testimony, that I did not read, I kind of wanted to tell you about myself. My son was part of the Head Start program about 4 years ago. He came home 1 day and said to me, "Dad, I want to be a paleontologist."

I said, "Aaron, what is a paleontologist?"

He said, "It is a scientist. They study dinosaur bones."

I said, "Oh, okay."

Now, I have got to tell you, if my son at 4 years old—the first year he went to the Head Start program—came to me because he had seen all kinds of books and all kinds of things inside the Ziegler Center, which is at the Head Start program in New Haven—if he could come home and say that to me, instead of thinking about drugs, which a lot of the kids that I see on my job at 4, 5, 6 years old—and believe me, if you think those ages are young, you would be surprised. These kids are wise. They are starting real early. My son was 4 years old at the time he came to me and told me he wanted to do this. These are the kinds of things I want him to dream about.

So you really need to do everything you can to make sure this program succeeds.

Thank you and good luck.

Senator DODD. Thank you very much.

Mr. MARTINEZ. It is we who should be thanking you.

Senator DODD. Thank you immensely for a perfect statement. And let us know where he practices paleontology. There are a couple of dinosaurs here in Congress. [Laughter.]

[The prepared statement of Mr. Hunter may be found in the appendix.]

Mr. MARTINEZ. Next, we will hear from Jeannie Kendall.

Ms. KENDALL. It is indeed a very high honor for me to be invited to Washington speak before this panel. Since coming to Washington, I have heard English spoken in many dialects, and now it is my turn to throw my Southern drawl into the ring.

As you can probably tell, I am from central Kentucky, and I am here to offer you a very personal parent point of view of Head Start.

I came to Washington with the goal of reaching you aloof politicians with a personal glimpse into the Head Start heart, and I am very, very pleased that I can relax; that all I have to do is confirm you have got it, and you are on the right track.

I have very much enjoyed everything I have seen and heard since I have been in Washington. I share something Donna said about the location of Head Start. I feel that the buildings that house Head Start are the only things that are not first class.

And I really loved what Michael said about embracing the child before the street does. I do not think I will ever forget that. It was very good.

While involved in the Head Start program, children become more aware of their abilities. They develop new skills, they interact with others, and they learn about the world outside their door. However,

parents often reap the exact same benefits. Like shadows, parents and children grow, and they reflect each other's growth. That makes a more positive living environment for all involved.

A few years ago, a young mother of four enrolled one of her children in a rural Head Start program. Unfortunately, she was very typical of the low-education, low-income, low-self-esteem cycle that the Head Start program targets. She had an unkempt appearance, and she was very silent, which reflected her despondent attitude toward life. Yet she was ripe for change.

Today, she is an effective worker for that same Head Start program and that same school system. She tutors adults, many of whom are Head Start parents, to read or to get their G.E.D. She is also a dean's list senior at Eastern Kentucky University nearby, and she is completing her semester of student teaching in preparation for spring graduation.

On Mother's Day, May 8, 1994, she will receive a bachelor of science degree in education from Eastern Kentucky University. In the audience will be her mother and her grandmother, each of whom the teachers had told had college potential, but they dropped out young, married and had children, just as their mothers before them had done.

Her father will also be there. He was one of her first G.E.D. students, and he is taking night college classes. Her grandfather, whom she admires most in life, will also be there. He has worked honestly and diligently all his life as a tenant farmer for more highly-educated owners of the land he worked. She had to watch him move off the farm he had worked 56 years; she had to watch him move to town and feel his pain. But on this day, May 8, 1994, he will watch her and feel her pride.

To complete her guest list will be her four children. Brady is a junior at Berea College. He loves baseball, and he has set records there. Jeana has completed 1 year of college also, and she is interested in the health field. Neil is a high school sophomore at Bourbon County High School. He was diagnosed with an eye-teaming problem when he was in Head Start. This is a very serious learning disability and would have ensured his failure. His mother was able to receive the training she needed and to give it to Neil so that he now has a chance to succeed in school.

Last, but far from least, is Nicholas, whose Head Start trainer informed his mother than he could read at 4 years old and that he had a very high potential in life. Indeed, Nicholas at that time wanted to grow up to be President Grant. We explained to him, "You have to be President Kendall," but he said, "Well, President Grant does not need his name anymore." [Laughter.] He remains interested in politics, and he is a member of the 8th grade academic team. He has dreams of visiting Washington, DC some day, just as his mother is today.

Obviously, this is my own story, Jeannie Maddox Kendall—but I have as many more like it as you would have time to listen to. I especially enjoy talking about my students, like a new grandparent does about her new grandchild.

I wondered at first why I was asked to speak here today, and I felt a little awed by it. But then I thought about it, and I think if you searched the whole Nation, you would not find stronger loy-

alty or gratitude than I feel for the Head Start program. I owe it a debt I cannot pay.

It was Head Start that first told me that the most important teacher my child would ever has is me. This gave parenting an importance and a more serious goal than I had come to believe before. It turned me from a passive parent into an active one, as I could see that a parent is not something you become; it is something you do.

It also taught me that I matter and that I can do it, whatever "it" may be. It employed me as a G.E.D. teacher, a job that has fit me like a glove. It gave me hope for myself, for my children, and for the others who share this planet.

You know that woman who enrolled her child in the Head Start program? She would have had trouble having a conversation with just one of you in the corner of this room. Her life had days that seemed to repeat each other. Her life seemed to blend into a sameness, with little hope for change. She would have simply repeated the cycle, and her children would have, also. But through Head Start involvement, she found the power to change her future, which in turn has changed many others.

There is Tracy, a young mother who had been put to bed with her fourth pregnancy, who learned algebra on her stomach. She called me 3 months later to say, "Ms. Kendall, did you really mean I could go to college?" I said, "Yes, Tracy; you definitely could." She not only graduated college and is a registered nurse now; she had a 4.0.

Then there was another student I recently had who learned English. He was a migrant worker. He is now an engineering student at University of Kentucky.

Just this past week, I was rewarded for my 2-1/2 years of effort when one of my literacy students worked his way up through the A.B.E. program and into the G.E.D. program and was able to pass his G.E.D.

As you consider these examples I have offered you this morning, I ask you this question: What price can you place on positive self-esteem—positive enough to speak before you today with confidence and conviction? What price can you put on hope? For that matter, I often wonder what cures have we missed, what songs lie unwritten because we have not nurtured the potentials of our human resources.

Head Start works. It is the best program one can fund to prevent crime, welfare growth, dropouts, and perhaps worst of all, empty lives. It breaks the cycle. It gives hope.

I pray you offer every child possible the benefit it provides, and that you reward those programs that actively court and involve parents as well.

In closing, let me say this, and I hope that you can understand my sincerity. The Head Start program did not just touch my life and the lives of my family. It made life worth living. And like a ripple in a pond, it passes on and on and on and on.

Thank you.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Thank you, Ms. Kendall, very much.

Senator DODD. Thank you, Jeannie.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Kendall may be found in the appendix.]

Mr. MARTINEZ. Jill Ryan?

Ms. RYAN. I would like to thank you for inviting me here today. My name is Jill Ryan, and I am here to speak on behalf of the many children and families out there who have really benefited from Head Start like myself and my daughter have, and I would like to see that continue for many, many years to come.

I will tell you a little bit about my own life and the beginning of Head Start for me. Approximately 9 years ago, I left an abusive marriage and everything that I owned in Nevada and moved back home with my 7-month-old baby at the time. I was glad to be safe and back home, but I also felt very alone. A back injury at the time was preventing me from working, and SSI disability was our only means of support.

Coming back home after a long period of time, it seemed as though my life was moving backward rather than forward. At first, I fell in with some of the "old crowd," so to speak, and some of my old friends tried to help me out. But in time, I began to realize that some of the help was really going to hurt me in the end, and I did not want to fall backward.

I wanted a safe environment for my daughter, one that was drug-free and without all-night parties going on around here, which unfortunately some people I knew, in the area where I was living at the time, it was very open, in front of everyone's children. I wanted more than that.

In self-defense, I centered myself on the most important part of my life—my daughter. I was an extremely overprotective mother at that time. Because I did not have a formal custody award, and my child was born in another State, I did not let Jennifer out of my sight. When I focused only on her, I did not have to think of myself, and it was an escape for me. But naturally, I fell into a rut doing so. It was not good for me or for my child.

After a while, I realized that I had to get her into an environment that would allow her to learn and play and grow and be with other children. I was trying to be a good mother on my own, but I knew my child needed more.

I had heard about the Head Start program several years before from friends, and I began to read quite a bit about it in the newspaper. I made an appointment to talk with the Worcester Head Start social worker, and she set up an interview and came to the home, which made me feel very comfortable.

I visited the center, and luckily, I was able to get Jennifer into a class that began in September of 1987. It felt like a safe place for me and my daughter to be, a place where we could both learn and grow.

The thing I liked best about Head Start was that I could participate. The teachers were wonderful. They always allowed me to be in the classroom with Jennifer whenever I felt I needed to be. But they also encouraged me to leave when it was appropriate and to attend workshops and to grow myself.

I discovered finally that Jennifer could exist without me for a few hours, and I could without her. The staff was always there to talk to me, to help me, and to encourage me. They made it possible to

give my daughter the space that she needed to grow. Head Start became an extended family for me.

The staff was always encouraging, but they were never overbearing. Parents were always encouraged to participate in the programs, to attend workshops, to volunteer in classrooms and attend parent meetings—but they were never forced to. The staff supported all of us and let us grow at our own pace, which I feel is very important. Not everyone is ready to move at the same pace or do the same thing at the same time.

For me, that meant being in a program where I was never far from my child, where I could learn parenting skills, meet people, and share with parents who were going through the same thing that I was.

Before I came to Head Start, I felt that there was something more I could be doing for my daughter, but I did not know exactly what. The parenting workshops helped me to be a much more effective mother. We had self-esteem workshops, talks about assertiveness and advocating for yourself and your children. We learned everything from discipline to presenting ourselves well in job interviews. I certainly got out of my rut, and my self-esteem greatly improved.

One day, I mentioned to the parent involvement coordinator that I had quit high school and never obtained a G.E.D. I guess I was afraid to fail, and being 36 at that time, it was rather hard to think about going back and learning all over again. She encouraged me very strong to go for it, and through Head Start, I attended several classes and obtained my G.E.D. and also became certified in CPR. I also became the parent representatives for three teachers who were going through the Child Development Association accreditation process, and I supported their applications before a panel which asked questions about the teachers' qualifications. I worked for 3 years on the personnel committee, also, giving me a lot of insight into how the program ran, and also the policy council.

It felt great to give back to the teachers of the program that had given so much to me and to my daughter.

Head Start has taught me to share of myself. It taught me to reach out, to ask questions and to voice my opinions openly and not be afraid. It also prepared me to deal effective with the public school system and to stand up for my child's rights, many of which I would not have realized existed if it had not been through a lot of things I learned during my daughter's time in Head Start.

For example, I attended a workshop on the Chapter 1 program, and when my daughter was in first grade, she really needed some help with reading. I approached the school about the Chapter 1 program, and they told me that she was borderline for it, and they were not going to accept her; but they did not see the struggle with her that I did. I fought my way through it, and Jennifer did receive the Chapter 1 help that she needed.

Now my daughter is 9 years old, and I am very proud to say that her reading level is at an "A." In fact, the day before yesterday, Jennifer was chosen for the PEAK program, which is "Providing Equity for Able Kids." It is designed to provide challenging elementary learning opportunities for academically and creatively talented elementary school children.

Head Start helped me to stand up for my child. Now Head Start is helping to change the schools for all children and families. Three years ago, Worcester Head Start got a grant to do one of the transition projects that Senator Kennedy sponsored. I sat on that committee with the Head Start director, Head Start parents, and public school principals. We talked about why parent input into the schools is so important. We answered questions and explained why these schools need to provide parent workshops, activities, and someone on site in the schools themselves to speak with the parents, the same way that the Head Start staff does.

I am a true believer in Head Start, and I actively participated in every way I could. I sat on our Head Start center committee and on the parent policy council. I was the state-wide representative to the regional Head Start association. Today, I work with 3-year-olds in a home-based Head Start program.

Because I am a former Head Start parent, other parents coming in to where I work feel very comfortable talking with me. They know that if they ask me a question, I will give them an honest answer. Seeing me at Head Start lets them know that they can move forward, too.

I would like to see the dram of Head Start continue for other families so they can share in the success and gratification which I have found. Head Start is a program that is needed. Sometimes, it is just a safe haven for a very needy child; other times, it can open a door for an entire family. Either way, Head Start works.

I would like to thank you again for having me here today, and I would like to thank my Worcester Head Start program for always being there for children, their staff and parents, whether it is to share a giggle or a tear, whatever is needed at the time.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Ryan may be found in the appendix.]

Mr. MARTINEZ. It is refreshing to hear your stories in that sometimes when we start evaluating programs here, we think about it in terms of dollars and cents, and we do not think in terms of lives. In your statement, you talked about the difference it has made in people's lives and the investment there. I think you referred to that tremendous investment that changes people's lives.

As a police officer, Michael—when I am able to, I watch that television program, "Cops." Have you ever seen that?

Mr. HUNTER. Yes, I have seen it.

Mr. MARTINEZ. And you see them go into these family situations, especially. In fact, just as a side note, my second son graduated from the academy in Los Angeles and went to work in the police department, but because the things he saw there were so different from what he saw growing up, it kind of turned him sour on it. I wish he had stayed with it, because he could have made a difference. I think people who stay with things when there are problems make a difference. And I am sure you are making a big difference in New Haven.

The life choices that you were given because of Head Start are good things to reflect to other people, that there is a different way to do things, and that you can do it a better way.

But as I started to say, as many stories like this as I have heard, I still find people on either side of the Congress here, in either House, questioning the results of this program, whether it is cost-effective, whether it is worthwhile. I think that somehow, we need to get the messages that you have all given here today out to more and more people. So we thank you for coming and giving this testimony that will be part of the record.

Ms. Hogle, I understand that you have an airplane to catch at 1:30, and you are flying out of National. I will allow the panel members to ask questions of you first, and then you may feel free to leave at any time.

Ms. MOLINARI. Marty, if I could just interrupt both you and the Senator, I unfortunately have to give a speech downtown, and we are in between votes. If I could just take one second to thank the panelists. Head Start is a great program, and it can perform miracles—but we are all quite aware of the fact that it cannot do much if the spirit is not willing in the individual. And for the courage that you have all shown, not only to change your lives around for your children and for your families, but to come here and share those stories with us, I just want to commend you, congratulate you, and thank you from the bottom of my heart. It meant a lot for us, and I certainly learned a lot this afternoon.

Thank you.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Thank you, Susan.

Senator Dodd?

Senator DODD. Let me just add my words of thanks, too. Your statements are far more important than any questions we could ask of you; you basically answered the questions with the statements that you have made.

There is the sense of frustration. As you point out, Michael, you see it every day in the streets of New Haven. We probably do not yet know who is responsible for that 7 or 8-month-old child's death the other day. This was a case, Mr. Chairman, where a 7-month-old infant was killed by gunshots fired into her home; they killed her and have probably turned her grandmother into a paraplegic or at least injured her very severely. The police speculate that it may be part of this random gang violence. And you will not shock anybody to find out it is a 15 or 16-year-old with a high-powered weapon—not that we know that, but nonetheless, we have seen so many incidences of it.

And we know this program works. We know it has made a difference in people's lives. I went to law school at the University of Louisville, and even though I am a Connecticut Yankee, I want you to know I have a great affection for Kentucky, and I think Berea College is one of the great institutions in America, and I am envious of your son who is there, Jeannie. It is a great, great school.

It is frustrating when we try to get people to support these efforts—and they are supportive—but to get the dollars behind it so we can get the people we are missing. And you were eloquent, Jeannie, talking about how many songs have been unwritten or books unwritten, or contributions to society, with talented, talented kids. And Michael, you see them every day—but for just a transition in the road, these talented kids that you are dragging into the police department could be getting 4.0's at University of Connecti-

cut or even Yale or anyplace else—just for a turn in the road. That is all it is, just a turn in the road.

If we could convince enough people here of the importance of it—I think we are making a good start with this reauthorization bill—and if Senator Jeffords and I can build some support around here to start committing some resources. We commit less than 2 percent of the entire Federal budget of the United States to the education of America's children; less than 2 percent of our entire Federal budget. And all we are saying is how about 10 percent. With all the rhetoric we hear in this city about the education of America, is it worth 10 percent of the Federal budget? We think it is. And that does not have to preclude the important investments we make in other areas of our society. And obviously, if it is, we can start talking about immediately funding these programs, having the kind of quality which is necessary, and including those children who are now missing.

So I want to add my voice to that of Congressman Martinez and Congresswoman Molinari, and thank you all immensely, particularly—and the other panelists will understand—express our local pride in you, Michael. I would like to get you involved in the State as well and maybe have you come out and talk to some of the other programs in some of the other communities around the State; if we might call upon you to do that, it would be a great help to us.

So thank you all very much. We look forward to working with you. Say hello to Kentucky for me, Jeannie. I miss it. I just hope that UConn beats Kentucky to death in the NCAA tournament—but other than that, I have great affection.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Thank you, Senator Dodd.

While Senator Dodd was talking, he struck a chord. I remember when Gus Hawkins, who is now retired, was chairman of the Education and Labor Committee and was on the other side in the House, trying to get people's support for reauthorization of the education program a few years back. And in an extension of remarks, which is remarks that are given after the House has finished its legislative business, he stated that the small amount that we spend on education in this country, and how important that education is to us, in almost everything we do, whether it is defense or just international competition in business. He started talking about the moneys devoted to that versus other moneys devoted to other things, and he said if you took all the entitlements out of the budget and looked at what we were spending on defense, it was two-thirds of our budget, and yet a pittance of it at that time, only 5 percent of the budget, was for education. And he demonstrated such a sharp contrast, and he alluded to the fact that some members on one side of the aisle would refer to members on the other side of the aisle as liberal big spenders and spending moneys on wasteful programs and such, and he stated that education certainly was not a wasteful program. But he mentioned a couple of the members' names, and one of them was one of our colleagues from California who was known for his conservative vote and his continuous vote "no" on every social program, but yet on defense programs, he was always there.

Well, in defense, he got up on the floor, and he said, "The only reason for the Federal Government to exist at all is to provide for the common defense. It says so in our Constitution."

Well, the next day, I went to the floor in extension of remarks and advised him that it was not in the Constitution—it was in the Preamble—but that he was ignoring six other reasons given in the Preamble for establishing the Constitution, not least of which was to promote the general welfare. And I do not see how you can do that unless you do exactly what we are doing in this program.

Having said that, let me ask just one question before we let this panel go, and anyone who wants to respond may do so. We have heard your success stories—and let me say that this is a very good question, and I would like to take full credit for it, but in all honesty, I cannot; Susan Molinari would have asked this question if she were here—it is very encouraging to hear your success stories, and millions like yours. But I guess all of us are wondering why more parents do not take advantage of it.

There was some debate during the advisory committee meetings about whether we should force a parent involvement component, force the parents to be involved—in other words, a child could not or would not be involve unless the parent agreed to be involved. Now, that is a very difficult situation given that some are single-parent families, and that parent may have to work and cannot get involved. There are lots of other reasons. We talked a little bit about this Jeannie, and when we talked about it, you said we have to do everything we can to encourage parent participation because it is as important for the parent as it is for the child.

What can we do, and what can the programs do out there, to really get more participation from the parents?

Ms. KENDALL. I cannot say that I would like to see it where the parent had to be involved, because of the exclusion of some children. If a child already has a parent who will not become involved in his or her life, and then you exclude them from Head Start, too, what chance do they have? So I would not like to see that component, honestly, personally. But on the other hand, how could you? I think I used the word "court." I would like the parents to be courted. I would like you to do surveys; see what they are interested in, and offer something they want. Dangle the carrot. Something it is something as simple as a craft.

I remember my first few visits making some little craft to put on my refrigerator at home; it gave me a little bit of pride in my home. Sometimes it is something that simple, and then, once you have got them, you can offer them parenting and some of the other things that they really need that are more serious.

I really do think, too, that it has to do with—all the Head Starts I have seen have very active parents. If there are Head Starts that do not, I would welcome visiting them to see what I think they are doing wrong. But I have visited a lot of Head Starts, and there are always very active parents, and that is usually due to well-selected staff. There has to be a person who really does care and is genuine. A lot of times, you will find Head Start parents in Head Start staff for the same reason that Jill said—we are very accepting of someone who came from our own ranks. It also gives you hope for climbing if you see someone who has done it.

So I guess that is the best answer I can give you is that I really would not like to see that legislation because of the exclusion of children, but what could be done is to heavily court that parent and offer them something that they want. They could handpick staff carefully.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Staff and recruitment and outreach?

Ms. KENDALL. I think also that component—I am curious—I think some kind of magic happens between staff and parents, and it has to have a low ratio to work. If you added that component, and parents had to come, then you would have to fund more staff and keep the ratio low. That is just the way I see it.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Good point. Thank you.

Ms. Hogle?

Ms. HOGLE. I would like to add one thing, and that is that we need to look at the definition of what parent involvement is. I think that parent involvement starts the day the parent picks up the telephone or walks in and enrolls his or her child in Head Start. I think parent involvement is when the parent takes the child to the dentist for follow-up treatment, and parent involvement is when the parent has the immunizations done.

I think our definition of parent involvement is old-fashioned. We look at parent involvement from the standpoint of attending a workshop or providing in-kind voluntary activity.

I think we need to look at behaviors as far as the parent being a responsible parent. And then I might say that I might think about that as a possibility of legislation. But I think until we redefine what we mean, I would have a problem like Jeannie, too, in terms of legislating that.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Jill?

Ms. RYAN. I agree with what both Donna and Jeannie said, and I also feel that as far as mandating a parent to come in, you run into situations where, yes, Head Start services low-income families, and I think a lot of people still look at that as though all low-income parents are at home and on welfare and are not working. Low-income families are sometimes working two jobs, or trying to go to school, or they may have a sickly older child or younger child at home, that would not enable them to come in. Or they may have a situation where they need counseling on a daily basis, or a situation where they need a safe place for their child so that they can grow elsewhere to better benefit their children after Head Start.

If it became mandated that they come into the centers, you would lose people before they even had a chance to realize how good the program was.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Thank you.

Michael?

Mr. HUNTER. I think I bring kind of a unique perspective in that my mother has been working for Head Start for 25 years. Right now, she is a parent coordinator with the program that my son was in. One of the things that I see that she does within her program is that she goes out to the parents. I see her many times transporting parents to and from meetings.

As you brought up, I think outreach workers are a very important aspect of the program. Even in my job, when I go into homes, I see drug-dependent parents, or a mother who is not at home, and

that child is home by himself at 6 o'clock in the evening or 10 o'clock in the evening, and that child has no direction. I think you have to address those issues. You have to address the problem and come up with some kind of solution as to how you are going to reach that particular family and whatever needs they have.

So I think what you need to do is develop some type of mechanism that will address individual needs, because every family has different problems. Maybe it is a single mother raising a family. You have got to address that. She is not home at night, so she is not going to be able to come to the meetings at night.

So the staff or the outreach workers—you are going to have to work on that aspect of it, I think.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Yes. I think outreach is the key.

Thank you very much. I again want to add my words of commendation to those of Senator Dodd and thank you all very much. This has been enlightening for all of us.

Senator DODD. Thank you all.

We are pleased to welcome the members of our last panel, who are going to give us their thoughts on the needs of the Head Start program and some reactions to the administration's proposals.

Sandra Kessler Hamburg is the vice president and director of education studies for the Committee for Economic Development. The CED has been in the forefront of making the connection between good early education and a productive work force of the future. CED has been a staunch supporter of Head Start and the need to reach more children, but they have also stressed the need for high-quality services.

Ms. Hamburg, we appreciate CED's long support as well as your concern, and we look forward to hearing your testimony this morning. Thanks for coming and thanks for listening. The last panel, we always call the "patient panel," because you have had to listen to everyone else. But I think it is worthwhile; I think you hear some wonderful testimony. I hope you enjoyed it.

We also welcome Valora Washington. Dr. Washington will give us an early childhood educator's perspective on Head Start and reauthorization. Dr. Washington is the vice president for programs for the W.K. Kellogg Foundation in Battle Creek, MI. She is a leading expert in early childhood education and serves as secretary of the National Association for the Education of Young Children. Dr. Washington recently served on the Head Start Advisory Committee, and we commend you for the terrific job you did as part of that committee and welcome you as well this morning and hope you have enjoyed listening to the testimony of particularly our last panel. I think it is always interesting to hear from people out there who are actually living with it and working with it every day.

We will accept all of your prepared statements and documentation as part of the record, but if you could try to keep your remarks to 5 minutes or so, so we can get to some questions.

Ms. Hamburg, we will begin with you.

STATEMENTS OF SANDRA KESSLER HAMBURG, VICE PRESIDENT AND DIRECTOR OF EDUCATION STUDIES, COMMITTEE FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, NEW YORK, NY; AND VALORA WASHINGTON, VICE PRESIDENT FOR PROGRAMS, W.K. KELLOGG FOUNDATION, BATTLE CREEK, MI

Ms. Hamburg. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I must say it certainly was well worth my patience and everyone else's patience to hear the last panel. It was also very humbling, because those are the real people whose lives this wonderful program enriches and helps and puts on the road to success.

But I am going to paraphrase CED's former chairman Brad Butler, the retired chairman of Proctor and Gamble, who often says, "If you are not moved by your heart, then at least we will try to move you through your head." And that is how I will be framing my testimony.

Senator DODD. Good.

Ms. Hamburg. As you know, of course, CED is an organization of 250 top business leaders who study long-term issues that affect the Nation's economy and social stability. We have a long track record in dealing with issues involving both education and the harder economic issues for the impact that they do have on our long-term prosperity.

More than 10 years ago, we started establishing a track record in this area, and we have produced a series so far of five policy statements that have addressed the strengthening of the Nation's human resources. They begin with "Investing in our Children" in 1985, followed by "Children in Need" in 1987, and have continued to this day with our most recent report, "Why Child Care Matters: Preparing Young Children for a More Productive America."

Each of these statements underscores the importance of greater investment in children's early development and education to the Nation's long-term economic vitality and social strength. These reports also accomplish something even more significant. Here was an organization of business leaders talking about education and early intervention as investments and not just as spending programs that accomplish little and cost the taxpayer money.

The trustees identify these programs as having real returns which benefit society, such as increased participation in the job market, more taxpaying citizens, and reduced crime, welfare, health, and other social costs.

More than any other educational program, Head Start has stood out for its potential long-term return on investment, as well as its ability to reshape the lives of both the children and the parents who participate. In recognition of this, CED has consistently endorsed the expansion of Head Start so that every eligible 3 and 4-year-old, and 5-year-olds not already in kindergarten, would be able to have a quality early learning experience before entering school.

Our trustees have long supported this principle, and I know a number of them have testified before you, Chairman Dodd, and other related subcommittees, such a Frank Doyle of GE and James Renier of Honeywell and numerous others.

Senator DODD. Absolutely.

Ms. Hamburg. We are very proud that the support CED's trustees have shown Head Start has contributed to a substantial expansion of the program over the years. However, we feel that the Nation is far from the goal of full enrollment that was envisioned back in 1987 in CED's report, "Children in Need."

The most recent CED report on early childhood education is "Why Child Care Matters: Preparing Young Children for a More Productive America," which was released in March of this year. Although this report nominally is about child care, a major thrust of the report is that for young children, child care and early education really are inseparable. That is why we devoted a significant portion of that report to a review of Head Start issues.

The report, I would like to say, was prepared by a panel of distinguished business leaders and child care and early childhood education experts, led by Robert E. Campbell, vice chairman of the Johnson & Johnson Company.

In revisiting the issue of Head Start, our trustees first of all confirmed their support for full enrollment of 3, 4, and 5-year-olds not already in kindergarten in the program. However, they also expressed their deep concern that too rapid an expansion of Head Start, without accompanying quality improvements would result in less successful outcomes for too many children and ultimately might undermine the program itself. They felt that the issue of quality is simply a matter of good business practice. Quality management has taught that sustained profitability of any organization, however that profitability may be defined, depends on maintaining consistent quality responsive to the needs of the customer. This principle is extremely important when we are talking about delivering services to young children which may affect their future growth and prosperity.

The quality of children's early development determines their readiness for school and is critical to their motivation and ability to learn. Parents know this. That is why three-quarters of parents earning more than $75,000 a year enroll their children in preschool voluntarily. Less affluent parents are just as eager to provide this advantage to their children, but many fewer can afford it. That is why only about 40 to 45 percent of the children whose family incomes would qualify them for Head Start are enrolled in either this or other preschool programs.

There is no doubt that high-quality early education for disadvantaged children can deliver on its promises. The latest cost-benefit data from the Perry Preschool Study continues to bear this out. The program has now followed its 123 participants to the age of 27—well into adulthood—and based on the substantially lower costs for welfare, criminal justice, health care and remedial education, and on the substantially higher earnings and taxes paid by the participants, the High Scope analysts calculate that every dollar invested in the program has to date yielded $17.16.

As impressive as these results are, it has to be kept in mind that Perry Preschool was a very high-quality, intensive, and comprehensive program. Although many Head Start programs deliver this optimal level of quality, too many others do not, and we have good documentation on that. We believe that unless consistently high quality becomes a hallmark of Head Start, both society and many

of the individual children who participate, and who currently do not participate but should be, may fail to reap the full benefits intended by the program and really needed by the Nation.

In revisiting this issue of Head Start quality, the CED subcommittee developed a series of recommendations that we believe will help Head Start more fully deliver on this promise. As you work toward the reauthorization of Head Start, we would urge you to keep these recommendations in mind.

First, we would support expanding enrollment at a slower pace if necessary so that additional funding can be earmarked to upgrading quality, improving salaries and expanding full-day services for children whose parents work or attend school full-time.

Second, we still, of course, support full enrollment and hope that we can make substantial progress toward that goal with the quality. So we recommend that funding targets which were authorized by Congress in 1991 should be revised to account for the need to both upgrade quality and provide places for all eligible 3, 4, and 5-year-olds not otherwise in kindergarten.

Third, improving the management skills of Head Start directors should be a priority. Program directors have to cobble together a variety of funding sources and coordinate myriad service providers to meet comprehensive education and care needs of children and their families. This requires a very sophisticated array of management skills that would daunt any experienced corporate manager.

I would like to mention an initiative in this area that could serve as a model, and that is the Johnson & Johnson Head Start Management Fellows Program, which they have been funding for about 3 years now.

Fourth, the lack of adequate facilities suitable for young children must be addressed. The National Head Start Association has estimated that between 1987 and 1990 alone, taxpayers lost nearly $13 million on renovations of now vacated facilities that Head Start programs rented rather than owned. We are pleased to see that the prohibition against owning facilities is no longer the law of the land, but we believe that much more needs to be done to address the issue of facilities.

Fifth, strong linkages are needed between Head Start and child care under the Family Support Act, since these programs serve much the same population. Parents often have to choose whether they will have their children participate in the enriched educational program of Head Start or whether they have to choose custodial care because of their working schedules.

Currently, only 6 percent of Head Start centers provide full-day care. Funding sources should be able to be combined more easily so that more Head Start and other comprehensive preschool programs would be able to provide full-day care for children of working parents at a single site.

Sixth and finally, better linkages between Head Start and elementary schools are absolutely critical. A number of recent studies have confirmed that sustained intervention is the key to maintaining Head Start's learning gains. Lack of such continuity is probably responsible for much of the fadeout effect seen in many of the Head Start studies.

These linkages are critical for ensuring not only the success of the children once they are in school, but also for the overall longitudinal success of the education restructuring movement itself, as embodied especially in the Goals 2000 legislation that has just cleared the Senate.

In conclusion, I would like to say that the business community, like all of America, has a stake in improving the Nation's investment in its young children. If too many children grow up uneducated and unskilled, the Nation will be poorer for it. Providing all disadvantaged children with the opportunity to participate in a quality Head Start experience is essential for putting them on the road to future success.

As you move ahead toward reauthorization of Head Start, CED reiterates its strong support both for expanding access and equally important, to improving the quality of this wonderful program.

Thank you.

Senator DODD. Thank you very much.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Hamburg may be found in the appendix.]

Senator DODD. Dr. Washington?

Ms. WASHINGTON. Thank you for allowing me to be here with you this morning.

What is really extraordinary about Head Start is what we heard in the first panel. I think that is the extent of the loyalty and the extent of the respect that people in the field have for this program. I think this is something that you do not see in other governmental programs, that while Head Start serves millions—and the number 13 million is generally accepted today—although millions are served, Head Start still has that capacity to address the needs and aspirations of the individual, and it offers hope and identifies a path to self-sufficiency and self-esteem and self-improvement. That is what is extraordinary about Head Start. It also gets the rest of us to really practice the wisdom of really owning all children in America. That is why we celebrate Head Start.

This capacity to support caring relationships that transform the quality of people's lives is also something that has been the hallmark of the Kellogg Foundation for the past 62 years. Founded in 1930 as the Child Welfare Fund, the Kellogg Foundation made over $262 million in grants last year, and most of our work emphasizes youth development and the application of knowledge to the problems of people.

The work that we do, just like the work of the Project Head Start, struggles continuously with the challenge of having multiple goals. As a member of the Advisory Committee on Head Start Quality and Expansion, I can assure you that we took a very close and a very critical look at Head Start effectiveness in the context of these multiple goals. We acknowledged the program's tremendous strengths, but we looked carefully at its limitations, and we did not accept its accomplishments uncritically.

What we wanted to make sure of was that Head Start could even better deliver on the promise of achieving excellence, and achieving excellence consistently across a range of program contexts and in the face of tremendous unmet needs for Head Start services.

It is in this context that I am going to offer my comments for the record and just speak briefly about what the advisory board recommends, but also what I see as the primary areas, which is a shorter list than what you will find in the advisory committee report.

I think the Head Start program for the 21st century has to strengthen its focus on building the capacity of families and communities to own their own solutions. The Head Start of the 21st century must enhance collaborative efforts with others, especially other child care programs and public schools. And the Head Start of the 21st century has to promote and create opportunities for leadership development.

In the first strategy, focusing on building the capacity of people to own their own solutions, I think we need to listen to the first panel, and we need to listen to what the communities and parents have been telling us for over a decade in Head Start. If we are going to be excellent across a variety of contexts, we have to maintain, especially in the face of expansion, that core culture and those core values that make Head Start work. And chief among those values is the emphasis on parents and communities taking the lead in determining what is going to work best for them.

If we listen to parents and what they want, that leads us to the first of my eight priority areas, and that is that we as a nation need to support a new initiative for Head Start, focusing on younger children and expanding Head Start to more children from zero to 3.

It also leads to the second of my eight priority areas, which is increasing the number of full-time Head Start programs. You all know the data, that only one percent of the children are under age 3, and only about 6 percent have full-day; so I do not need to expand on that. Foundations like the Kellogg Foundation are funding a number of Head Start programs like the one in south central Michigan, where we are trying to help a number of counties in Michigan to expand Head Start to full-day by providing them money for wrap-around services, making links with child care homes and so forth. But the Federal Government can do more in this regard.

The second thing is that the Head Start of the 21st century has to create or enhance Head Start's collaborative efforts, especially with other child care programs in public schools. You know the new study that came out in 1992 that showed that although transition activities for all children are not widespread, we can do better, and we already know more than we are doing about how to make transition work.

What I think we have to do is really renew the Head Start Transition Project Act, which expires this fiscal year. Those grants were just started in 1990, and they need more time to demonstrate and articulate promising practices.

We also need, as my fourth priority area, to explore the use of more incentive grants to facilitate planning for comprehensive services of care on a local level. Again, the Kellogg Foundation is making major investments with Head Start programs, and with the National Head Start Association, to build these partnerships in States and to give the National Head Start Association money that they

can then subgrant to local grantees to build partnerships. Here is an area where the Federal Government can build upon what is being learned in these pilot projects.

Last, I feel that the Head Start of the 21st century has to promote and create opportunities for leadership development. Leadership development is the hallmark of the Kellogg Foundation. I am sure you are all aware of the Kellogg Fellowship programs, both nationally and internationally, since we work throughout the United States and Latin America and in southern Africa.

I urge you to consider how important leadership development is. Part of leadership development is a renewal and a review of the performance standards, which we do not need a law to do, but I think that what we would need your attention to is to finalize some performance standards for the zero to 3 infant and toddler group.

As part of the leadership development initiative, I would also urge you to look at the establishment of local staffing plans and minimum qualification standards for Head Start staff. You know that except for the education components, there are no minimum education requirements for Head Start staff; the salaries are too low, and the staff caseloads are too high. These are areas we need to take into consideration.

A third component of the leadership initiative that I would urge you to move forward with is strengthening the capacity of the Federal and regional staff to provide oversight, but not monitoring in a negative sense, and also to provide support to local grantees. There is need for more support in that area.

Finally, the eighth of my priority areas which also falls under the general area of leadership development is that we need more training and technical assistance related to the management of local programs. We are all familiar with the Johnson & Johnson initiative. Much more can be done in that area.

These are the eight priority areas that I feel are important. All of these areas are contained in the report that you have just received from the advisory committee. We have got to respond to families and communities by serving younger kids, by providing more full-time opportunities. We have got to build partnerships with the broader human services fields by renewing the Head Start Transition Project and using incentive grants in local communities. And we must enhance the leadership capacity of staff by reviewing the performance standards, establishing staffing patterns and competencies, and strengthening Federal regional oversight and strengthening training and technical assistance.

These recommendations are offered as a way of building upon what works. We know better than what we are doing. It is clear that Head Start is effective, and it can be even more so as family and community needs evolve.

In the midst of the challenges that Head Start faces, we celebrate Head Start, because Head Start programs have encouraged communities to create and implement innovative ways of addressing the needs of children and families. If you are a parent behind bars, if you are a family without a home, if you are a family who has faced rejection or isolation because someone in your family has AIDS—in these and in all other kinds of instance, Head Start has

created innovative models that are leading the way, and we can achieve that kind of excellence everywhere for every child.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Washington is retained in the files of the committee.]

Senator DODD. Thank you very, very much. That was excellent testimony from both of you, and we are deeply appreciative of your thoughts and suggestions.

Let me quickly pick up on a couple of points. On the staffing issue, I could not agree with you more. Too often in the past, our Head Start teachers have been sort of in transition themselves, waiting for a "real job" in the elementary or middle schools, in some cases high school, but in sort of a "holding tank" until you entered into a formal educational position. That was for obvious reasons. Salaries and so on were such that you could not possibly survive and meet any kind of basic living standards as a Head Start teacher. It is amazing to me that as many have stayed in the program as long as they have, and we are grateful to them.

Obviously, a very critical element is consistency—that a child have that consistency not just at home, but in school, or in these early childhood development programs, so that for the 2 or 3 years they may be there, there is some consistency to really help solidify their experiences.

I keep on having this recurring dream that it is the year 2094, and I am being called as a witness to answer questions about what our generation did on some of these matters and why it was that we valued teachers, if you will, at one end of the educational spectrum, entirely different at the other, when the evidence was so overwhelming that we needed the best-qualified, sensitive, experienced people at the earliest stages of a person's life—and how did we come to that conclusion, and was I supportive of that, or did I do anything to try to change that. I am trying to answer these questions of a prosecutor in the year 2094, and obviously, I do not have very many good answers.

We need to break this kind of mind set that is so ridiculous and attract the best possible people we can to make careers and to consider career options in this area, not merely, "I will hold this job until another one comes along where I can get higher recognition and better benefits and whatever else in the teaching arena."

So I really want to underscore that particular point and to also emphasize the qualification issue. This always evokes tremendous reaction from people. And obviously, you have got to be sensitive in how you do this, but nonetheless the idea that anybody can do this is, again, mindless. Having standards is critically important and demonstrable proof that people can handle these jobs and know what they are doing. Not just anybody can come in and do it. We have got to get away from that notion, in my view.

So I am grateful to you for your comments on this. Again, I think the added element of working with families—not just working with children, but working with families—needs to be stressed as well.

I would like to ask you specific questions, if I could, in two areas—and you can comment on this last particular point if you care to. First, Ms. Hamburg, on the question of management skills—and I think I agree with you—we have seen a heightened degree of interest on the part of the business community in second-

ary education as well as elementary education. There is a growing appreciation of the importance, in a direct way, of the product that we produce from our school systems and how it affects the ability of business to then have a potential work force from which to draw upon.

I wonder if you might suggest to us how we might attract more business participation and involvement in management here. Obviously, your companies and others here are involved, but we need to have it at the local level to generate more interest and to invite them to be more of a participant in the management aspects of Head Start.

Ms. Hamburg. I agree. I think certainly, the program that Johnson & Johnson has established to upgrade the management skills of Head Start directors is a model of this kind of effort. They bring Head Start directors to I think it is UCLA—and I think they are going to be expanding it to other campuses around the country—and not only give them the same kind of management training that a corporate manager would go through, but they then have a process whereby they send them back to their program, and they have to develop a management plan and follow that through.

I am not sure how you get other companies to be involved in this kind of thing, and there are so many other issues that are pressing for attention on the agendas of corporate leadership, so I would not recommend that we just exhort companies to replicate this kind of thing—although maybe that is the answer, just exhorting companies.

Senator DODD. What about something like local advisory boards, where you invite successful small businesses, so it is an ongoing involvement. I think Johnson & Johnson is very good in the training. Do you see any dangers in having the local business community becoming more involved on a daily basis with the success of a Head Start program?

Ms. Hamburg. I think certainly this is something that has to be dealt with on a community-by-community basis. I think where Head Start can be shown to fit into the larger perspective of education and the school system, and where we can build collaborations around the whole holistic process of care in education from birth through even college and bring educators to the table with business people at the local level to provide input in those areas that are important in the local communities, I think whatever can be done to encourage that process should be done. I do not think there is any down side at all to it.

Senator DODD. Do you want to comment on this, Ms. Washington?

Ms. WASHINGTON. Yes. The Kellogg Foundation is experimenting with a number of ways to get businesses and the corporate community more involved not just in Head Start, but in the broader child services arena.

There was a recent study around the six education goals that showed that while many corporations say they are most committed to Goal 1, they actually put their dollars in education in other goals. So here are some of the things that we are trying to experiment with, for example.

In some communities, we have provided incentive grants so that we could get a coalition of corporate sponsors, say, in one case, downtown employers, to contribute to a pool of funds that would provide additional support for a local program, so that all of the businesses can participate according to their capacity. A shoe-shine business might give $200 a year, and a Fortune 500 company might give another amount. But then, they are all contributing, and they make a long-term commitment to contribute that amount over time. That is one idea that we are using.

In another experiment that we are trying, we are asking communities if they are able politically to make a commitment to the broader child-serving community, and then we are in the process of inviting teams of people from those communities to undergo training and visioning and other kinds of activities that would help the corporate community contribute more.

The key to that, we are finding, is getting them involved up front, getting them involved with the corporate and civic leaders as well as with people form the child care community in a team that then makes a commitment to long-term planning, and then we provide certain resources to give incentives, and we also use our resources to bring to their availability the top and best minds that can help them do that kind of planning and thinking at a community level.

Senator DODD. Good. Let me ask you both—you may have heard me say that I am drafting a transition to school proposal as part of the elementary education effort, and I am going to be presenting it to my colleagues and the administration shortly after next week—what do you think the most important elements ought to be in that program?

Ms. WASHINGTON. I think one of things that we have to be careful about with transition is that transition moves so much beyond just moving records from place to place. You know that really well. Of course, moving records from place to place would be an improvement in many communities, but we cannot just stop with that.

I think one of the most important things is for the teachers from the various early childhood experiences and from the K-3 experiences to have opportunities to think and plan together, with parents, as equal partners at the table, about what a developmentally appropriate, culturally responsive, early childhood time of life would look like from zero to 8. So that would be from the preschool experiences through the 3rd grade teachers, involving all of them, and—say if your school is a neighborhood-based attendance area—get all those preschools, Head Starts, and the teachers and principals all sitting down together with the parents, thinking about what is developmentally appropriate and what is culturally responsive in our neighborhood and in our community.

That is happening, as you know, with the federally-sponsored transition grants that are now existing and in a number of demonstration projects that foundations are funding.

So I think that common training, creating opportunities for that conversation, the cross-training, and the welcoming parents are the most critical things that I would pay attention to.

Ms. Hamburg. I would just add—in CED, we have not really gone into the specifics of how you do this kind of thing, creating

a transition that is really effective, so I did not want to get into too many specifics on that; I think I could certainly support everything Valora just said—but I would just like to add that the principle is so important that we think that oftentimes the school systems do not make the effort to connect to either the Head Start or the other early childhood education programs in their communities. And I think there needs to be much more of a process of communication initiated by the school district to reach out to those providers and the Head Start community.

Senator DODD. Good point. On Monday, I spent a couple of hours in Hartford's public school system, which has a Montessori program that is funded by the Hartford public schools. It is very different. It also serves children from 12 other communities besides Hartford, to get more diversity. We have children who are travelling from literally an hour to an hour and a half to come to this program. It is 3-year-olds, and they are eventually going to move it into a school environment through grade 12. We have also got to get bonding issues approved and so forth, and there is a sliding fee scale for the younger children, so it is very involved.

But it is a good example, and when people tell me that the public schools in our communities are not being creative enough or imaginative enough, they are just not paying attention to what is going on in their own communities. There are some very creative things occurring in our communities.

But I still get the sense, even with the community being as imaginative as this one is, that it is kind of an add-on, kind of an afterthought, that, well, if we have room, we will try to fit this in around the back door, and so forth. I hope I am not being unfair to them, but I get the sense that it is not seen as part of this seamless garment of the educational experience that is so critically important. But nonetheless I commend them immensely for what they are doing, because it is imaginative, and it is creative, and it is early childhood development, and Head Start is the ingredient.

It involves Montessori teaching techniques, which, of course, a lot of them are included in Head Start programs, anyway; it is hard to tell where Montessori ends and Head Start begins and so forth in some of these classrooms. So it is extremely worthwhile.

If you have any additional thoughts on this transition issue, we would like to get them from you fairly soon, because we are in the drafting stage, and it would be nice to have those ahead of time.

Thank you very much for your testimony.

Mr. Chairman?

Mr. MARTINEZ. I really do not have any questions. I think you covered most of the questions I would have asked. There is perhaps one that you were asking in regard to businesses at the local level getting involved in Head Start.

As I understand it from your testimony, these major companies have determined that they are getting involved because the issue itself is significant to what we become as a country. I think that is true. And when Senator Dodd was talking to you about their involvement, I was thinking about if you have ever been in local business, and your chamber of commerce comes around and tries to sign you up for the chamber of commerce, the first thing the business owner wants to know before he pays dues to the chamber of

commerce is: How do I benefit by this? And you have got to show him something generally on a business level, in dollars and cents, that he benefits by it.

The major companies have already determined in dollars and cents that they get people who are more employable, people that they are able to train, people that they can easily train for the positions they have and be more responsible in those positions—a whole raft of things that benefit them and the overall economy. How do we translate that back to the local level, and how do we make them understand why it is so important for them? Let us take a small shop that hires six people versus a shope that hires 100 people. They are more apt to come in contact with a greater need for people who are more trainable, more responsible, more likely to have the desire to work and stay with the company and have a career with the company.

Those things are sometimes not tangible. Can the major corporations help, because almost all small businesses in some way or another are connected to major businesses. Is there some way?

Ms. Hamburg. Well, I think one of the most effective ways would be at the local level, through the chamber of commerce or whatever the local business organization is—maybe a group like Kiwanis, which has a nationwide, in fact an international Young Children Priority One program—is to assemble panels like we just heard from, the panel that preceded ours, to hear from former Head Start children, Head Start parents, about what the program has done for them and what kind of productive lives they have achieved as a result.

Beyond the dollars and cents issue that hits the head, hitting the heart and opening the eyes to the actual people in the community who have benefited from the program and who contribute to their bottom line as local business people is the best thing you can do.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Well, the program that Johnson & Johnson runs, as you were explaining, you send people who are going to staff that to quality schools where they can get training in the things that they are going to be doing. On the local level, it is rather hard for a smaller company to put together the resources to do that.

In the legislation as it is drafted now, there is a promotion to encourage private and public partnerships on a local level. The whole idea is to leverage the money that the Federal Government puts in.

It is interesting that in one hearing we held a long time ago on a different subject, but there is sort of a linkage, a couple of the witnesses were from Fortune 500 companies, and they talked about their obligation and responsibility to our country and to education and to providing those kinds of things that were necessary to make sure that there was more training at the local level available. They described that they felt a responsibility, but they did not feel that it was their responsibility alone; that it was as much the Government's responsibility as theirs, and they did not want to end up holding the bag, all of a sudden being responsible for the whole thing.

I guess that same thing prevails on the local level. We need some leadership from Government entities or from the Federal Government itself to say we will provide the seed money, and we will teach you how to leverage that on the local level by getting other

moneys, and maybe helping to attain that full funding that we need to attain.

If you have any ideas along that line as to how we might set a process in place where we will start achieving that, nationwide, then we would certainly like to hear it.

Ms. WASHINGTON. Mr. Chairman, that fits in with the recommendation that I made. The Kellogg Foundation has 15 communities that we are working in to try to provide that coordination and bring in business communities.

What we are finding that works is when you tie the local corporate dollars to things that local corporate people can see, and then be specifically honored for. That is why the idea that I mentioned earlier about having corporate funds and pools of funds that they put into—even neighborhood, or downtown, or a particular region of town—early childhood efforts, that then they can see and they identify with, and because they are contributing to a pool, I think what we are finding is that a number of the local businesses are afraid that they are going to get involved in a bottomless pit, and they do not understand it. So by defining it generally, and having them contribute to a pool, we have found that it has eased their comfort level and their willingness to participate—and that is very different from asking them to, say, set up a child care center at their plant or something like that. They are in a pool. They can feel good about it. It helps specific children in their community. It is tied to something they can see and feel and feel good about at home.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Very good. I think that is a good idea.

One of the things I want to say just before closing, Senator Dodd, is that I share with you your opinion that often, Head Start people and the quality of people who are doing the educating in the Head Start programs, are not what they should be, mainly because the salaries are not there, and we have not set minimum qualifications for teaching. But if we do, we are going to have to realize that we must put the dollars there.

Like you, Senator Dodd, I have found people in programs in different places—I recently visited the Virgin Islands, where the staff there was of such quality you would not believe. Any one of the people there could probably be making three or four times the money they were making there. The director of that center is what attracted these people to that center. She has kind of a Mahatma Ghandi presence about her; she is a magnet. You talk to her, and you can just see it, and I guess that is why she has attracted these people to an area of great need, because these people in this particular Head Start in the Virgin Islands are all people who are disadvantaged in every way, and they are really becoming advantaged through this program.

Senator DODD. Well, thank you both very, very much for your testimony and your help today. And let me say to my colleague from the House, Chairman Martinez, what a pleasure it has been to be a part of this hearing with him. We have learned a lot from our witnesses this morning, and our job is now to move forward and try to mark up this legislation and consider some alternative ideas along the way if necessary, and then present it to our col-

leagues for their approval. So your testimony has been very, very helpful. I am thankful to you and thankful to my colleague.

I wanted to mention Emily Wolf, who is here helping out. Emily has teaching experience, and is a social worker, and she has been a full-time volunteer for the subcommittee. She helped put together today's hearing and did a very, very good job.

I also thank Patty Cole and Sarah Flanagan from my staff, who have been very much a part of today, as well as other members of the Senate side and the House side. I want to thank them for their help, and I look forward to hearing from everyone very shortly.

APPENDIX

PREPARED STATEMENT OF MARY JO BANE

Chairman Dodd, Chairman Martinez, and members of the Committees, it is my great pleasure to come before this joint hearing of the Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources' Subcommittee on Children, Family, Drugs, and Alcoholism and the House Committee on Education and Labor's Subcommittee on Human Resources to present testimony in support of the Administration's proposal to reauthorize and strengthen the Head Start program. We are proud that this bill reflects the bipartisan support Head Start has enjoyed throughout its history. We would like to thank members and staff for their hard work and commitment to the Head Start program.

Since 1965, Head Start has served over 13 million low-income children and their families. But the significance of Head Start is not told in the numbers of children served, but in the stories of individual families whose lives have been dramatically changed through their involvement in Head Start. I wish you all could have heard Diane Hebert, a Head Start parent from Woburn, Massachusetts, when she testified last month at Senator Kennedy's hearing on the release of the report of the Advisory Committee on Head Start Quality and Expansion. Diane, a married mother with four sons, found herself living in fear and isolation in a public housing project, using drugs "as a crutch" to get through each day. After one of her sons enrolled in Head Start, she, too, became involved in the program. Diane told how she was able to "put down drugs and pick up Head Start." She said, "Each time I felt like I wanted to use drugs, I'd go over to the Head Start program, and I too would feel safe and wanted."

It was to ensure that Head Start would continue to provide quality services to people like Diane Hebert and her sons that Secretary Shalala formed the Advisory Committee on Head Start Quality and Expansion. The Advisory Committee was asked to conduct a thorough review of the Head Start program and to make recommendations for its improvement and expansion. After six months of deliberations, including extensive outreach and a review of existing reports and data, the 47-member bipartisan committee released its final report, "Creating a 21st Century Head Start." The unanimous report presents the most comprehensive set of recommendations in the program's history. These recommendations are rooted in three solid principles:

> We must ensure that every Head Start program can deliver on Head Start's vision, by striving for excellence in serving both children and families.
>
> We must expand the number of children served and the scope of services provided in a manner that is more responsive to the needs of children and families.
>
> We must encourage Head Start to forge partnerships with key community and State institutions, the private sector and programs in early childhood, parent involvement, family literacy, family support, health, education, and mental health, and we must ensure that these partnerships are constantly renewed and recrafted to fit changes in families, communities and State and national policies.

When she appointed the members of the Advisory Committee Secretary Shalala said:

> "We want to ensure that more children reach school ready to learn. And we want every Head Start program to offer the comprehensive family services and high quality early childhood experience that are the core of the Head Start vision."

This year's reauthorization of the Head Start program provides us a wonderful opportunity to renew the Head Start vision and to put into action the recommendations of the Advisory Committee as we seek to build a stronger Head Start program for the 21st Century.

Overview of the Head Start Amendments of 1994:

The Administration's proposed reauthorization bill demonstrates that we take seriously the recommendations of the Advisory committee on Head Start Quality and Expansion. The bill incorporates the priorities and framework identified by the bipartisan committee, beginning with a strong emphasis on quality in Head Start programs. The proposed legislation includes tough new provisions to ensure that no grantee will continue to provide services if it falls below a minimum quality level and fails to correct the deficiencies promptly. Further, the bill requires the promulgation of performance measures; strengthens performance standards; establishes a minimum standard of accomplishment for all grantees; strengthens current author-

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ity regarding staff qualifications and development; and for the first time, requires that past performance be taken into account in allocating expansion funds. The proposed legislation again echoes the Advisory Committee's recommendations in the area of expansion. It encourages strategic planning at the national and local levels, ensuring that new funds are allocated to communities with the greatest need and that local programs are afforded the flexibility to meet local needs—such as providing full-day, full-year services to families working or in training. Finally, the bill reaffirms a commitment to partnerships. In particular, it places new emphasis on the need for Head Start to assist children in their continuing educational and social development, by establishing effective communication and coordination between Head Start programs and the schools, and by educating parents to continue to be effective advocates and partners in their children's education once they leave Head Start.

I am pleased to provide an overview of the bill's major provisions.

Quality

The Advisory Committee's review of Head Start found that most programs provide quality services to children and families, but that quality is uneven across the country. For instance, some problems that have been identified in monitoring visits by the Department include insufficient parent participation in decisionmaking, an absence of written procedures, inadequate follow-up to assure the delivery of needed social services, and a need for greater staff and parent training in child development. The Advisory Committee's report stressed that no Head Start program should be allowed to fall below a minimum level of programmatic and fiscal performance, and that programs should strive to go beyond meeting minimum standards to achieving excellence in serving both children and families. The Administration's proposed legislation seeks to accomplish this dual goal of establishing a minimum floor of quality while striving for excellence.

Monitoring and Quality Assurance

The first step in ensuring quality is to ensure that we have appropriate standards and measures by which program performance can be judged. The next step is to ensure that they are used appropriately in monitoring so that program deficiencies can be identified and corrected in a timely manner.

Over the past 18 years, Head Start's Program Performance standards have defined the scope and quality of the services that local programs are expected to provide to all enrolled children and their families. The Advisory Committee reaffirmed the role and value of the Performance Standards, but recommended that they be reviewed and revised to reflect changing circumstances affecting Head Start children and families, the evolution of best practices in the fields of family support and early childhood development, the experience gained in using the Standards since 1975, and the anticipated needs of a growing Head Start program. The proposed legislation adopts this recommendation and directs the Department of Health and Human Services to review and revise the Performance Standards. It further requires that the Department consult with experts in the fields of child development and family services, and with persons having direct experience in the operation of Head Start programs, as it undertakes its review of the Performance Standards.

The proposed legislation also adopts the Advisory Committee's recommendation that the Department develop Performance Measures which could be used to assess the effectiveness of Head Start programs by identifying strengths and weaknesses nationally and by region and to target training and technical assistance. The bill also calls on the Department to facilitate the use of these measures by local programs to assist them in undertaking periodic self-assessments; developing staffing, training and technical assistance plans; and establishing priorities for the use of quality improvement funds.

A very important quality assurance provision contained in the proposed bill is a section addressing poorly performing grantees. I want to stress that we in the Administration are very serious about making sure that every Head Start program is providing quality services to children and families. The Department has already begun to take steps to identify poorly performing grantees, design corrective actions, provide technical assistance, and, if corrective actions fail, to terminate funding to the grantee. The provisions in the proposed reauthorization bill will strengthen these initial efforts to deal with poorly performing grantees.

The proposal specifies that if the Department determines that a Head Start program fails to meet minimum compliance levels with respect to the Performance Standards or other requirements, the non-compliant program will be required to develop a quality improvement plan, subject to Departmental approval, detailing the deficiencies to be corrected, the actions that will be taken by the program to correct those deficiencies and the timetables within which corrective actions will be imple-

mented. Within the limits of available resources, the Department will provide training and technical assistance needed to implement the approved program improvement plan. If the program fails to achieve compliance within a reasonable period of time (not to exceed one year), the bill makes clear that the Department will take steps to terminate the program and, if circumstances warrant, to appoint an interim grantee pending recompetition of the program. To ensure that the Department is able to carry out this provision effectively, the bill also proposes amending current monitoring provisions to require expeditious return visits to programs found to be substantially out of compliance with the Performance standards.

Staff Qualifications and Development

As important as quality assurance is, it is equally important to invest in Head Start staff to ensure excellence. Head Start is a program that relies on the personal skills of 100,000 front line staff and managers and the relationships developed between Head Start staff and the families and children they serve. The Advisory Committee believed so strongly in the need for staff development that it identified it as the first step to be addressed.

The proposed legislation also contains strong provisions on staff qualifications and development. It requires the Department to develop model staffing plans to provide guidance to local Head Start programs on such issues as staffing levels, qualifications and training. The bill reaffirms the commitment to enhancing the qualifications of classroom teachers and adds provisions addressing qualifications for family service workers who play a crucial role in working with families. These new provisions call for the Department, in consultation with the early childhood and family support communities, to define the competencies which staff working directly with families should possess; to review, revise and issue new qualifications standards, as needed; and to promote the development of model curricula for Head Start staff, including curricula which address parenting training and family literacy. The bill would also promote the establishment of a national training and credentialling system for family service workers.

Another specific recommendation of the Advisory Committee reflected in the proposed legislation is an initiative to encourage the placement of qualified "mentor teachers" in Head Start programs. The bill calls on the Department to provide technical assistance and training to enable Head Start programs to establish mentor teacher positions. Mentor teachers would supervise and support small numbers of classroom staff and provide on-the-job guidance and training to Head Start program staff and volunteers. In addition to providing more decentralized, qualified supervision to classroom staff, the mentor teacher position would serve as a career development opportunity for individuals who are classroom teachers.

Expansion and Strategic Planning and Needs Assessment

In examining the issue of expansion, the Advisory Committee concluded that there was a need to expand both the number of children served and the scope of services provided in order to meet the changing needs of today's families. However, it also emphasized that there must be a strategic approach to expansion. The Administration's proposed reauthorization bill affirms the need for strategic planning in expanding the Head Start program and outlines principles to guide future expansions. First, it reinforces a strong commitment to quality by directing the Department to take into account an applicant's past performance in delivering high quality services and in making effective use of expansion dollars. Second, it proposes to direct resources to communities where they are most needed by taking into account both the relative numbers of unserved eligible children and the relative concentrations of poverty. Finally, it calls on the Department to consider the extent to which the applicant has undertaken community-wide strategic planning and needs assessments involving other community organizations serving children and families.

The emphasis on community planning and needs assessment will both permit and encourage local programs to strike a balance between the need to reach additional children and families and the need to expand services, including full-day, full-year services, to better meet the needs of families.

Serving Families with Infants and Toddlers

The Advisory Committee's report noted that when Head Start was created in 1965, it reflected the understanding that, especially for children in high risk circumstances, school entry was too late for society to lend a helping hand to families to prepare their children for life-long learning. It went on to note that research today indicates that, for many families, providing one year of half-day preschool for four year olds may be too little too late. The prenatal period and the first three years of life play a critical role in the establishment of basic health and other fundamental elements of child development. Furthermore, an emerging body of re-

search indicates that early supports to families with young children can have a positive effect on family functioning and overall child development. In recognition of this research, the overwhelming majority of Advisory Committee members recommended that the Department develop a new initiative for expanded Head Start supports to families with children under age three. Such an initiative would build on the knowledge and experience gained through existing Head Start programs serving younger children, including Parent-Child Centers, the Migrant Head Start program, and the Comprehensive Child Development Program.

The Administration's bill, therefore, includes a provision to build on Head Start's traditional role as a "national laboratory" in the early childhood field by including an initiative to serve families with infants and toddlers. Beginning in fiscal year 1995, grants would be made to projects which provide, either directly or through referral, a comprehensive range of" childhood development, parent education, social services, family literacy, vocational education and employment-related services. Funded projects would also undertake activities which link parents and children with other community-based services; and promote the planning, development and expansion of comprehensive family-oriented programs for low-income parents with young children. The specific programmatic content of the program would be developed by the Department in consultation with experts in early childhood development and family services. Funding would be open to a broad range of public and private agencies in the child and family services field that are able to provide high-quality, comprehensive services meeting Head Start Performance Standards. This section would replace the Parent Child Centers in the current Head Start legislation and would consolidate the Comprehensive Child Development program.

Partnerships

The third major theme of the Advisory Committee's report was the need for Head Start to forge and renew partnerships. The proposed legislation addresses the especially crucial partnership between Head Start and schools in two ways. First, it would improve the formal coordination between Head Start programs and the schools to promote developmental continuity for Head Start children and to help them retain the gains made while in Head Start. Second, it would empower parents to deal effectively with the schools and enable them to be active partners in the education of their children. To accompliah these aims, Head start programs would establish systematic procedures for ensuring that information about each child is shared among Head Start staff, school staff and parents. They would also provide training to Head Start parents to enable them to continue to be actively involved in their children's education as they move from Head Start to the schools.

In addition to these provisions, the proposed legislation would renew funding for two years for the Head Start Transition Project Act, to permit existing demonstration projects to complete their work and it wou'd commit the Secretaries of HHS and Education to work together to assess the results of the transition project and to assist local communities in implementing the most promising transition practices.

Conclusion

This is an exciting moment in the history of the Head Start program. We have the opportunity to build on the many strengths of Head Start—strengths that have won Head Start the support of members of both political parties, experts in early childhood development and, perhaps most importantly, the millions of families served over the past 29 years. In the report of the Advisory Committee on Head Start Quality and Expansion, "Creating a 21st Century Head Start," we have a solid blueprint to guide our efforts to renew the vision of Head Start. And, I believe, in the Administration's proposed legislation reauthorizing Head Start, we have the framework to make that renewed vision a reality. We look forward to continuing to work with all of you during the reauthorization process.

PREPARED STATEMENT OF MICHAEL HUNTER

My name is Michael Hunter. I have been a Police Officer in the City of New Haven for approximately 2½ years in a city where I was born and raised. I would first like to thank you for this opportunity to give this testimony.

In today's time our nation is faced with an epidemic of firearm violence and we are forced to protect ourselves and our families against drug dealers, thereby declaring war on these individuals.

In my earlier years as a pre-schooler, gun play was not an epidemic running rampant through our nation's cities and neighborhoods. The epidemic that exists today is like a cancer clinging onto every youth it comes in contact with.

I come before you today to say that I was faced at one time with the disadvantages of growing up in a broker home and being raised by my mother in a housing

project in the City of New Haven, Connecticut. I could easily have become part of the problems our Nation faces today with our youths. But unlike many of other children, I received an early start in life when my mother enrolled me in a new program called Head Start. The Head Start program embraced me—it sent me on a positive part in life, instilling in me as a pre-schooler positive hopes and dreams of a different way of life. The Head Start Program also awakened me as a pre-schooler to know that my dreams of a better life could be achieved within the boundaries of the laws of society.

When we take charge of our youth by giving them alternative programs such as Head Start, they receive a better foundation and sense of direction before the streets have a chance to trap them. The Head Start program will embrace our youths by sending them through a functional path in our society. Teaching them other ways to achieve their goals, giving them positive dreams to want to fulfill as a pre-schooler.

My son Aaron who has always loved dinosaurs, came to me one day when he was four years old after visiting the Zigler Center in New Haven with the Head Start program and said "Daddy, I want to be a Paleontologist when I grow up". I looked at him bewildered and asked him what a Paleontologist was and he said, "It's a scientist who studies dinosaurs and their bones". Ladies and Gentlemen, not only was I surprised at my son's answer, I was speechless. This is the kind of dream I want my son to have . . . not a dream of selling a drug bundle.

We should all know that we have no time to waste. Acts of violence involving firearms have grown to the point that there shouldn't be any question that parents should have the opportunity to enroll their children in Head Start. Time is running out, it is gone. The time to act is now without hesitation or second thoughts. As we all know, it isn't often you get a second chance.

As I mentioned earlier, this epidemic is like a cancer which needs early treatment. The treatment is simple, we need to embrace our children early before the streets do. We need the Head Start Program which will give us the first opportunity to instill some values in our preschoolers which they will be able to carry through life. This will allow them to embrace their dreams as they were embraced in early life. It is time to realize that what we teach and instill in our children early never leaves them. Whether it be positive or negative. It will determine what road our children will take in life. The Head Start Program is early treatment to the deviant social behavior our Nation faces. The deterioration of our youths' value system and dreams of a fulfilling life is to the point that we can't afford not to have the Head Start Program.

When I think about all the positive experiences and accomplishments in my life, I know they are due to Head Start's philosophy. Head Start provided the nurturing at an early age and instilled a "Yes I Can" attitude in me. When you grow up in an environment such as I did, where every vice and temptation is lurking about, it is so easy to get involved, and before you know it, you are trapped in a life of degradation.

Head Start, its name alone tells what it did for me. It's positive reinforcement provided a mental checklist to help me make good choices early in life. When a child is provided with good nurturing and positive role models, and given the tools to make good choices early in life, the returned dividends are endless. As a police officer I witness everyday what makes a child fail in life.

I will only site one example due to the short time span. When a child is in a home with parents who are substance abuse dependent, their learning environment, nutrition, mental health and their safety are all in jeopardy. Because of this negative environment, it is most likely the beginning of that child's downfall. These parents are unable to live productive lives for themselves, let alone provide for the child's needs. Through my experience with Head Start and as a parent, I have found that the Head Start Program with it's recruitment techniques can refer the family the proper support mechanisms it needs while at the same time providing a learning environment for their pre-schooler(s).

PREPARED STATEMENT OF JILL RYAN

Senators, Representatives, I would like to thank you for inviting me here today. My name is Jill Ryan, and I am here to speak to you today on behalf of the many children and families who are benefitting from Head Start as my daughter Jennifer and I have.

Approximately nine years ago, I left an abusive marriage and everything I owned in Nevada and came home to Massachusetts with my seven month old baby. I was glad to be safe, but I felt very alone. A back injury prevented me from working, and my $51 disability checks were our only support.

My life was moving backwards instead of forwards. My old friends tried to help me out, but I thought their "help" might hurt instead. I wanted a safe environment for my daughter, one that was drug-free and without all-night parties going on around us. Too many people I knew were still living that way, openly, in front of their children. That wasn't what I wanted for myself any more, and that certainly wasn't what I wanted for Jennifer.

In self defense, I centered myself on the most important part of my life: my daughter. I was an extremely overprotective mom. Because I didn't have a formal custody award at the time, I didn't want to let Jennifer out of my sight. When I focused only on her, I didn't have to think about myself. I got into a rut. It wasn't good for me or for my child. After a while, I realized that I had to get her into an environment that would allow her to learn and play and grow, and be around other kids. I was trying to be a good mom on my own, but my child was missing out on something.

I heard about Head Start through a friend, and did a little reading about it in the newspaper. I made an appointment to talk to the Worcester Head Start social worker, and visited the center. It felt like a safe place for me and my daughter to be, a place where we could both learn and grow. Luckily, I was able to get Jennifer into a class that began in September of 1987.

The thing that I liked best about Head Start was that I could participate. The teachers were wonderful. They let me stay in the class with Jennifer when I needed to, but they also encouraged me to leave when that was appropriate. I discovered that Jennifer was fine when I left—but I wasn't. The staff were always there to talk to me, to help me, to encourage me. They made it possible for me to give my daughter the space she needed to grow.

The staff were always encouraging, but they were never overbearing. Parents were always encouraged to participate in the program, but we were never forced to go. The staff supported us, allowing parents to grow at our own pace. For me, that meant being in a program where I was never far from my child, where I could learn parenting skills, meet people, and share stories with parents who were going through the same things I was.

Before I came to Head Start, I felt that there was something more I could be doing for Jennifer, but I didn't know what. The parenting workshops helped me to be a more effective mom. We had self esteem workshops, talks about being assertive, standing up for yourself and your child. We learned everything from how to discipline your child effectively to how to present yourself in a job interview. I started to come out of my shell. My self esteem improved.

One day I mentioned to the parent involvement coordinator that I had never graduated from high school. I guess I was afraid to fail. It's hard to think about getting your GED when you're thirty-six. You feel like it's too late. You wonder, "How can I learn this?" But the staff supported me. Head Start found a class for me to take, and I got my GED. I also became the parent representative for three teachers going through their Child Development Associate accreditation process, and supported their applications before a panel who asked me questions about the teachers' qualifications. It felt great to give back to the teachers that had given so much to me and my daughter.

Head Start taught me to share of myself. It taught me to reach out, to ask questions, and to voice my opinions openly. It prepared me to deal effectively with the public school system and stand up for my child's rights. Head Start taught me about the Chapter I program. When my daughter was in the first grade, she needed help in reading. I appealed to the school for that help. They told me she was borderline and didn't need the program. But they didn't see her struggling the way I did. Eventually, I convinced the school to get her help.

Now my daughter is nine, and I am very proud to say that her reading is at the A level. In fact, the day before yesterday,Jennifer was chosen for the Providing Equity for Able Kids Program, which is designed to provide challenging elementary learning opportunities for academically and creatively talented elementary school kids.

Head Start helped me stick up for my child. Now Head Start is helping to change the schools for all children and families. Three years ago, Worcester Head Start got a grant to do one of the transition projects that Senator Kennedy sponsored. I sat on the committee with the Head Start Directors, Head Start parents, and public school principals. We talked about why parent input in schools is so important. We answered questions, and explained why the schools need to provide parent workshops, activities, and transportation, the way that Head Start does.

I am a true believer in Head Start, and I actively participate in every way I can. I sat on our Head Start center committee and on the Parent Policy; Council. I was the state-wide representative to the regional Head Start association. Today, I work

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

with three year olds in a home based Head Start program. Because I am a former Head Start parent, other parents feel comfortable with me. They feel that they can ask me something and I'll give them an honest answer. Seeing me working at the Head Start center lets them know that they can move forward in their lives, too.

Thank you again for inviting me here today to speak to you about Head Start. I would like to see the dream of Head Start continued for other families, so they can share in the Success and gratification which I have found. Head Start is a program that's needed. Sometimes it's just a safe haven for a needy child. Sometimes it opens a door for an entire family. Either way, it works.

PREPARED STATEMENT OF SANDRA KESSLER HAMBURG

Mr. Chairmen, my name is Sandra Kessler Hamburg, and I am vice president and director of education studies for the Committee for Economic Development, a nonprofit, nonpartisan research and policy organization comprised of 250 of the nation's top business leaders and educators. I am delighted to be here today to address an issue that has long been of concern to the CED trustees, and which continues to engage their attention. Namely, the critical link between the quality of children's early education and development and their ability to mature into responsible, informed, and productive citizens. I am very pleased, therefore, to testify on the importance of improving the quality of Head Start, the primary federal program that addresses the early education and developmental needs of low-income, disadvantaged preschoolers.

Some people are still surprised to find business speaking out on issues involving the well-being of young children. For CED, such outspokenness is the natural outgrowth of our mission as an organization. Two years ago, CED celebrated the 50th anniversary of its creation in 1942, when FDR, anticipating the end of the world war, formed a committee of business leaders to assist in moving the economy from war to peace. CED's early policy work in the post-war years influenced development of the Marshall Plan and the Bretton Woods Agreement, which led to the establishment of the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund. On the domestic side, CED's earliest work on education contributed to the establishment of the GI Bill.

Since that time, CED has devoted its attention to those issues that most affect the long-term economic well-being of the nation's citizens. Although CED has usually concentrated on the typical range of economic concerns—tax and budget,trade and monetary and similar issues—we have ventured often into the field of education, because we have long believed this issue to have significant consequences for our nation's productivity and competitiveness.

It was for this reason that more than ten years ago—well before the release of A Nation At Risk—CED's trustees embarked on what has become a series of landmark studies on the role of education in ensuring the nation's economic future.In five policy statements—Investing in Our Children: Business and the Public Schools (1985), Children in Need: Investment Strategies for the Educationally Disadvantaged (1987), An America That Works: The Life-Cycle Approach to a Competitive Work Force (1990), The Unfinished Agenda: A New Vision for Education and Child Development (1991), and, most recently, Why Child Care Matters: Preparing Young Children for a More Productive America (1993)—CED has crafted a broad strategy for strengthening the nation's human resources. Each of these statements underscored the importance of greater investment in children's early development and education to the nation's long-term economic vitality and social strength.

These reports also accomplished something even more significant. Here was an organization of business leaders talking about education and early intervention as "investments" and looking at social programs in a new light. Not just as spending programs that accomplish little and cost the taxpayer money, but as programs that have real returns which benefit society, such as increased participation in the job market, more tax-paying citizens, and reduced crime, welfare, health, and other costs. The idea of a positive "return on investment" is the spark that first ignited business involvement in education and child development. However, it is safe to say that it isn't just the numbers but the positive impact of programs like Head Start on human lives that keeps on driving the interest of CED's business trustees.

More than any other educational program, Head Start has stood out for its potential long-term return on investment as well as its ability to reshape the lives of both the children and the parents who participate in the program. In recognition of this, CED has consistently endorsed the expansion of Head Start or similar state level comprehensive preschool programs for disadvantaged children so that every eligible three- and four-year-old would be able to have a quality early learning experience before entering school. CED's long-standing support of Head Start is well evidenced

by the numerous CED trustees who have testified, sometimes more than once, before these and related Congressional committees on the issue of improving early childhood education and development. These CED trustees have included Frank P. Doyle, executive vice president of GE, James J. Renier, chairman of the executive committee of Honeywell, Inc., Owen B. Butler, chairman of Northern Telecom, Ltd. and retired chairman of Procter & Gamble, William S. Woodside, chairman of Sky Chefs, Inc., John L. Clendenin, chairman & CEO of BellSouth Corporation, and Robert C. Winters, chairman and CEO of The Prudential Insurance Company of America. In addition to Head Start, CED trustees have been vocal supporters of such important related programs as WIC, Chapter 1, and the National Education Goals.

We are very proud that the support CED's trustees have shown for Head Start contributed substantially to the increased visibility and political support the program has received in recent years. We are very gratified that this support has led to increased funding and a substantial expansion of the program. However, as far back as 1987, in our report, Children in Need. we urged that full funding of the program for all three-, four-, and five-year-olds not already enrolled in kindergarten be phased in over a five-year period. We are far from that goal. Currently, only about 40 percent of eligible children are enrolled.

CED's trustees recently reaffirmed their support for full funding of Head Start in our most recent policy statement on early childhood education, which was released in March 1993. Titled Why Child Care Matters: Preparing Young Children for a More Productive America. the report was prepared by a panel of distinguished business leaders and child care and early childhood education experts, chaired by Robert E. Campbell, vice chairman of Johnson & Johnson.

However, in revisiting the issue our trustees expressed their deep concern that Head Start expansion must be accompanied by quality improvements. This is simply a matter of good business practice. The quality management movement has taught that sustained profitability depends on maintaining consistent quality responsive to the needs of the customer. The same basic rule should apply to any organization, profit-making or nonprofit, that provides goods or services, especially if those services are directed to children and are designed to improve their futures.

We know that quality early childhood education for disadvantaged children can offer substantial returns for society's investment. The most familiar financial expression of these returns comes from the High/Scope Perry Preschool Study, which has followed a group of 123 program participants into the present and periodically assessed how well they are doing. The most recent assessment took place when the original participants turned 27 years old. The High/Scope researchers calculated that every dollar invested in the program has to date yielded $7.16 in terms of lower welfare, criminal justice, health care, and remedial education costs and higher earnings and taxes paid by program participants. For example, the current analysis found that four times as many program participants as nonparticipants earned $2,000 or more per month. Almost three times as many owned their own homes. One-third more graduated from high school, and female participants were five times more likely to be married and have had only about two thirds as many out-of wedlock births.

Nevertheless, it must be kept in mind that these findings were based on the results of a very high quality, intensive, and comprehensive program. Although many Head Start programs deliver this optimal level of quality, too many others do not. They may lack the appropriate level of funding for the population they serve, they may lack the management expertise to coordinate the many components that go into delivering comprehensive services, they may lack the educational expertise to provide a quality learning experience, or they may have substandard facilities that pose a danger to children. Whatever the reason, unless consistently high quality becomes a hallmark of the Head Start program, both society and many individual children may fail to reap the full benefits intended by the program.

In revisiting the issue of Head Start, the CED Subcommittee on Child Care developed a series of recommendations which we believe will help Head Start more fully deliver on its promise. As you work towards the reauthorization of Head Start,we would urge you to keep these recommendations in mind:

Expansion of Head Start should not occur without corresponding improvements in the overall quality of its programs. Absent the ability at this time to provide substantial new funding, we would support expanding enrollment at a slower pace so that additional funding can be earmarked to upgrade quality, improve salaries, and expand full-day services for children whose parents work or attend school full time.

Phased-in full-funding targets for Head Start, which were authorized by Congress in 1991, should be revised to reflect the need to upgrade quality so that funding will eventually be adequate to provide high quality programs for all eli-

gible three-, four-, and five-year-olds not otherwise in kindergarten. In Why Child Care Matters, we estimated that it would take approximately $6.6 billion to provide quality half-day services to all eligible children, and a total of $9.0 billion to provide 25 percent of these children with full-day services. These figures are based on estimates made a year ago and would probably be a bit higher today.

Management skills of Head Start directors need to be addressed. Program directors have a complex job to do. For example, they are often responsible for cobbling together a variety of funding sources and for coordinating Head Start with child care programs in order to meet the full-day care needs of disadvantaged preschoolers. Coordinating Head Start with the variety of social and health services needed for a comprehensive network of support for children and families requires a sophisticated level of skills that would daunt the most experienced corporate manager. One initiative in this area that deserves notice is the Head Start Management Fellows Program that was developed by Johnson & Johnson to provide management training to Head Start directors.

Sufficient attention must be paid to the serious lack of facilities that is likely to occur as the program continues to expand. The National Head Start Association estimates that between 1987 and 1990 taxpayers "lost" nearly $13 million on renovations of now-vacated program facilities. Although Head Start programs are no longer enjoined by law from owning their own facilities,programs still face a dearth of spaces suitable for young children. Partnerships like that established in New Jersey by the Prudential Foundation and Invest in Children, a coalition of New Jersey business, education, human services, and advocacy groups, should be encouraged.

Strong linkages should be established between Head Start programs and child care options approved under the Family Support Act. It is critical to recognize that the children served by both programs are drawn largely from the same population. Many of these children have parents who work or attend school and need full-day care. Often the parents who are in the FSA programs are forced to choose low-quality custodial care for their children rather than high-quality preschool in order to accommodate their working schedules. Funding sources should be able to be combined more easily so that more Head Start and other comprehensive preschool programs would be able to provide full-day care for children of working parents at a single site. In addition, Head Start rules requiring parental participation should be revised to allow more children of parents who are employed full time to stay in the program.

Every effort should be made to provide follow-through in elementary school for Head Start graduates. A number of recent studies have demonstrated that sustained intervention is the critical key for maintaining the learning gains that preschoolers make in Head Start. Although the draft legislation phases out the promising Head Start Transition Project, we believe some systematic coordination between Head Start and elementary schools must be put in place. Without such linkages, for both children and their parents, the cognitive and social benefits of Head Start are more likely to fade out

Finally, to ensure that Head Start and other early education and child care programs for poor children are truly comprehensive, we urge that they be coordinated with a variety of family support services in the community, such as family literacy, parenting education, and health care.

Early childhood education and development are critical building blocks of the nation's "human investment strategy." The quality of children's early development determines their readiness for school and is critical to their motivation and ability to learn Parents know this. That is why three-quarters of families earning more than $75,000 a year enroll their children in preschool. Less affluent parents are just as eager to provide this advantage to their children, but many fewer can afford it. Only about 40 percent of the children whose family incomes would render them eligible for Head Start are enrolled in this or other preschool programs. It is clear that we have a long way to go before the first National Education Goal, the one that states that "By the year 2000, all children in America will start school ready to learn," can be reached.

The business community, like all of America, has a stake in improving the nation's investment in its young children. If too many children grow up uneducated and unskilled, the nation will be the poorer for it. Providing all disadvantaged children with the opportunity to participate in a quality Head Start experience is essential for putting them on the road to future success. As you move ahead toward reauthorization of the Head Start program, CED reiterates its strong support for both

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

expanding access to Head Start as well as improving this important program's quality.

PREPARED STATEMENT OF DONNA HOGLE

Mr. Chairman, and Members of the Committee;

I would like to thank you for the opportunity to speak with you today. The Indiana Head Start programs greatly appreciate your continued support and interest regarding the services we provide to our children, families and communities. I would like to give a special thank you to Senator Coats for your ongoing concern regarding our "Hoosier" Head Start programs.

My name is Donna Hogle. I am the Head Start Director for the South Central Community Action Head Start in Bloomington, Indiana which is 48 miles south of Indianapolis. I have been in Head Start since 1976 and the Director since 1979. The observations that I share with you today are based on my experiences as a director; my training background in home economics, community development and instructional technology; and most importantly my discussions with other Head Start programs. I am here to represent both my program and the Indiana Head Start Association of which I have been a member for 16 years. I am currently a Board member of the Association.

My program is a one county program serving 191 children in an urban/ small town setting. We provide part-day programming for children through three educational options. Our services are housed in three sites; one built by our grantee, the second located in a county parks and recreation center, and the third in a housing authority community room.

Our mission is to provide growth opportunities for low-income children and their families through the combined resources of families, staff and the community. Our program vision is to provide or secure comprehensive services for low-income families of children ages birth to 8.

In preparation for my testimony I reviewed "Creating a 21st Century Head Start", the final report of the Advisory Committee on Head Start Quality and Excellence. I was extremely impressed with the thoughtfulness and comprehensiveness of their recommendations. As I read the report, I was both excited about the prospects in terms of my program's vision and at the same time overwhelmed at the thought of implementing them.

I think I can say that the Indiana Head Start Association endorses the findings of this final report. We believe that the issues of quality, excellence, flexibility and partnerships must be addressed in order for Head Start to achieve its potential impact on the lives of our children and families. As an Association, we are committed to support the implementation of the Advisory Committees recommendations. We, therefore:

- encourage Congress to continue to provide the 25% quality set aside monies so programs can raise standards of services and quality of staff.
- encourage Congress to ensure that local programs have flexibility to expand services so as to accommodate full-year, full-day programs and services to infants and toddlers. Like so many states, Indiana's communities reflect a wide range of cultures and needs. We wish to meet the needs whether they are of rural Amish families or those families living in urban settings.
- encourage a redesigning of the federal oversight to insure more program accountability as well as contact. We would like to have increased technical assistance occurring between Regional offices and local programs. In other words a stronger partnership.

I am sure most of you are familiar with the parable that ends with the statement -- but for the want of a nail the war was lost. It begins with a farrier putting new shoes on a general's horse. He fails to do a through job and as a result the horse looses a shoe, the general is killed and the war is ultimately lost. As you begin to consider the re-authorization of Head Start, we would like you to consider the integrated and the holistic nature of Head Start. Like the general we will not be able to do our job if the basic foundations are not in place. You, the Congress, provide the foundations.

Concurrently it is critical that consideration be given regarding the impact of changes and how they can ripple throughout a Head Start program. Head Start programs are complex, interconnected systems; each component in part depends upon the success of another.

I would like to give you an example of what I mean. When I surveyed a number of urban and rural Head Start programs, in order to prepare this testimony, I asked them what they considered to be the main issues in Indiana. While the comments were varied most boiled down to lack of adequate facilities and qualified, appropriately paid staff.

Key comments regarding facilities were:

- Most programs are dealing with costly and inadequate facilities. We can't provide quality early childhood education in some of the facilities we are forced to use. That is if we can find them.
- We spend large sums of money on buildings owned by others. When they need the facility we are both out of the space and the monies we invested.
- Even though we know we need to have some day care we have no locations. The lack of space affects our ability to provide greater flexibility in programming.
- According to Indiana child care licensing, Head Start programs do not need to be licensed because of the length of the day. However most Indiana programs wish to be licensed as part of our quality efforts. Yet we can't find centers to meet the licensing standards. One of the urban programs with 28 centers currently has 25 not

licensed due to inadequacies of sites. They ask where and how should we spend our monies.

- At our On-Site Review, it was strongly recommended we relocate to another space as the one we were in was inadequate. We could not find one.
- The way the current funding system is we don't have time to locate adequate facilities to expand our services. Everything is hurry up and do it yesterday; we have no time to plan.

I would like to share my program's situation with you. In the last 27 years we have been in over 12 locations. After many years of trying to locate appropriate sites our grantee built a wonderful new building which we moved into in January 1993. It has enabled us to provide a developmentally appropriate environment for children, to expand the number of children we serve, and to provide space for parent activities. However, we have lost over $50,000.00 of inkind, we now have new and different costs to consider, and we have no place to grow due to the original funding limitations in terms of building size. As I have said, in Head Start -- everything is interrelated.

I would like to diverge for a moment and further expand on my comment related to inkind. For 27 years Head Start communities have demonstrated on-going support of their Head Start programs. Yet as more services enter communities, Head Start budget increase, Head Start programs purchase their own buildings, and parents enter the work force or school raising inkind has become increasingly difficult. At this time Indiana does not provide any financial support for Head Start programs. There have been times when I have entertained the notion of not applying for more HHS monies. While I do think inkind is an important demonstration of community support I would like to suggest that the amount required might be reviewed and assessed.

The second most mentioned issue by Indiana Head Start programs relates to the quality issue of staff and their salaries. When I surveyed the Indiana Head Start programs, nearly all mentioned this issue. I am sure you have heard many of these comments but I would like to share them with you:

- Staff turn over is high because our staff go to other placed like the schools. There they will receive higher salaries. This turn over not only includes teachers but bus drivers as well. When we constantly change staff, the quality of our services is reduced.
- We can't get people to apply for jobs because of our salaries. The other aspect is that we are a rural program and there are very few, if any, people with Child Development Credentials.
- We need more training for administrators like directors and coordinators. The national monies seem to focus primarily on teachers. But administrators are constantly being asked to do more. We aren't trained for some of the things now required.

The Head Start programs of Indiana encourage you to carry out the recommendations of the Advisory Committee in terms of the improvement of training systems and salary enhancement of staff. The quality of any organization is only as high as is the quality of the staff. The managers are only as effective as those people who actually carry out the job tasks.

Recently a mental health trainer provided a workshop at my program. He related a situation where he had worked with a social service program that was closing its doors. His job was to aid staff in dealing with the closing. Part of the process was to ask the staff what they had done in the agency and why they were there. He said it was very enlightening. Those people who had been with the agency a long time expressed great passion and knowledge about the goals and visions and clients. The newer staff were there primarily for the money and benefits; they lacked the passion, the drive, and the sense of purpose. I believe while we need to maintain our passion, we must also make Head Start a place in which people can afford to work.

In the years I have been a director I have seen shifts in the directions of the program. What has clearly shifted is that we can no longer be satisfied with being a "maternalistic presence" in the lives of our children and families. By this I mean parents often perceive Head Start as a maternal and naturing support system. We increasingly establish a system to carry out the "business" of Head Start in an effective yet humanistic manner. I believe that Indiana Head Start programs desire to provide the best services possible. If this committee will heed the wise words of the Advisory Committee and incorporate their findings in to the re-authorization of Head Start, we can demonstrate to the American taxpayer our worth as contributors to a better society.

Once again thank you for you attention.

PREPARED STATEMENT OF JEANNIE KENDALL

While involved in the Head Start Program, children become more aware of their abilities. They develop new skills, learn to interact with others, and discover the world outside their door. However, parents often reap the exact same benefits. Like shadows, parents and children grow-- and reflect each other growth resulting in a more positive living environment for all involved.

A few years ago, a young mother of four enrolled one of her children in a rural Head Start Program. She was unfortunately typical of the low-education, low-income, low-self-esteem cycle that the Head Start Program was designed to target.

Today, she is an effective worker for a school system, tutoring adults, many of who are Head Start Parents, to read or earn GED certificates. She is also a Dean's List senior at a state college near by and is presently completing her semester of student teaching in preparation of her spring graduation.

On Mother's Day, May 8, 1994, she will receive a Bachelor of Science Degree in Education.

In the audience will be her mother and grandmother, each of whom teachers had felt to be "college-material," though they both quit school while young and married as their mothers before them had done.

Her father will also be present who was one of her first GED students and who has a perfect 4.0 in the night college classes he has since taken. Also, her grandfather will be there, who she perhaps has admired most, and who has worked honestly and deligently all his life as a tenant farmer for higher educated owners. She watched in silence and felt his pain as he had to move to town off the place he had worked over fifty-six years. But this day, he will watch her and feel her pride.

To complete her guest list, her four children plan to be there: Brady, a junior at Berea College where he has set records in baseball; Jeana, who has completed one year at Eastern Ky University and has interest in the health field; and Neil, a high-school sophomore, who was diagnosed with an eye-teaming problem while in Head Start. (His mother received the training and was able to give the therapy needed to give him a chance to succeed in school.) And last, but far from least, Nicholas, whose Head Start trainer informed his mother that he could indeed read at four years old. Indeed, Nicholas who then wanted to grow up to be President Grant. He remains interested in politics and is a member of his eighth grade academic team. He hopes to visit Washington someday --like his mother is today.

Obviously, this story is my own, but I have as many more like it as you have time to hear. I especially enjoy talking about my students like new grandparents do with their grandchildren.

You will find no stronger loyalty or gratitude than I feel for the Head Start Program.

It was the Head Start Program who first told me that: "The most important teacher my children will ever have is me." This gave parenting an importance and a more serious goal than I had come to believe before.

It also taught me that -- "I matter" and "I can do it!" whatever "it" may be. It gave me hope for myself, for my children, and others who share this planet.

The woman who enrolled in Head Start would have trouble with conversation with another adult with her days which seemed a repeat of the one before and her life which seemed to blend into sameness with little hope of change.

What price could be placed on positive self-esteem -- positive enough to stand before you, a congressional committee, and testify with confidence and conviction?

For that matter-- what cures have been missed or songs left unwritten due to low self-esteem and lack of opportunity to nurture potentials?

Head Start Works! It is the best program one can fund to prevent crime, welfare growth, drop-outs, and perhaps worst of all, --empty lives. I pray you offer every child possible the benefits it provides. And that you reward those programs that actively court and improve parents lives also.

In closing, let me say that the Head Start program did not just TOUCH my life and those of my families. Head Start MADE it worth living, and like a ripple in a pond-- it passes on and on and on!

Thank you for your kind attention. I welcome your questions.

Senator DODD. The subcommittee will stand adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 12:59 p.m., the joint hearing was concluded.]

ISBN 0-16-044348-2